LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.
BX9571
Chap. ..... Copyright No. ..S3..
Shelf .....
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

MERCERSBURG THEOLOGY.

MERCERSBURG THEOLOGY

INCONSISTENT

WITH PROTESTANT AND REFORMED DOCTRINE.

BY

B. S. SCHNECK, D.D.

Be not carried about with divers and strange doctrines. For it is a good thing that the heart be established with grace.—Heb. xiii. 9.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
COPYRIGHT
1874
No 1095E
WASHINGTON.

PHILADELPHIA:
J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO.

CHAMBERSBURG:
J. N. SNIDER.

CINCINNATI:
OFFICE "CHRISTIAN WORLD," 178 ELM ST.
1874.

BX9571
.S3

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1874, by
B. S. SCHNECK, D.D.,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress at Washington.

Right of Translation Reserved.

INSTEAD OF A PREFACE.

[The following letter from an esteemed ministerial brother tells all that is necessary to be said in the way of motive for preparing the following work. This letter and its author, therefore, must be regarded as sharing the chief responsibility in an undertaking which, in itself, had no attractions for me in any view of the case.]

"Reverend and Dear Brother:

* * * * * * * *

"Like yourself, I have taken no part in the unfortunate controversies which have been going on for years in our Church. Honestly believing that matters were not so grave and serious as some supposed, and confiding in the oft-repeated declaration that our professors and others were misunderstood, I was led to exercise to the utmost that charity which 'hopeth all things and believeth all things.' And so I was even disposed to defend these brethren. In ecclesiastical affairs I also stood by them. Yet I had to acknowledge to myself all the while that in defending their teachings—for instance, against Messrs. Bomberger, Good, Williard, etc.—there was often a want of manly candor and an effort to avoid meeting the weightier points in dispute. Thus, when proofs were furnished from history by those brethren against some of the doctrinal teachings by the professors, those proofs were as often not noticed. When Reformed standards were quoted as against the professors on some of the gravest questions, that was quietly passed by. But when a little flaw in an opponent was thought to be discovered, then there was a loud trumpet sounded in regard to it, winding up with what looked very much like gauzy cunning, by telling the reader that 'such was the way with every thing which came from that side, and hence it was not worth while to notice the opponents.' Thus, some Western writer, it seems, had said something in reference to the present or revised Liturgy

('Order of Worship'), and called it the 'new Order of Worship' (or perhaps 'New Order of Worship'). That was a life-and-death question! To put the word *new* before the title was an offense of very grave magnitude; and so the Western man is pounced upon with ludicrous ferocity, and duly informed, 'as in such cases made and provided,' that if a man does not study and duly know the proper and authorized *title* of a book, he is incompetent to write on the *subject* of the book, or for that matter, I suppose, on any other subject. Now look at it. The *revised* Liturgy ('Order of Worship') *is* the 'new,' as compared with the former or first Liturgy by the committee, and has been so called over and over again by its own friends in the *Messenger*, and has been so called even by Dr. Nevin himself, the chief author of the book! (See Vindic. of Lit., p. 51, etc.) Now, such and similar things have all along been noticed by myself and others with pain, but I refrained from dwelling upon them. So also the late effort to cast reproach upon Dr. B., Dr. G., and others, in connection with the conversion of several of our ministers to the Roman Catholic Church, had a most painful effect upon my mind; and several others, ministers and laymen, I found, were impressed in the same way. I looked at it in this way. Here are several men who were among the *leaders* of the Mercersburg theology. They wrote fiery articles about it, and some of them bitter articles against some of the best and most useful men in our Church,—men whom, although I differed from them in some things, I could not but respect and honor. For years it had been believed that those recent converts were traveling towards Rome, but when it was sometimes hinted at, not only those men themselves denied it but our professors and others publicly denied that the theological system of Mercersburg *could* lead any one to that 'citadel of safety.' But one and another at last *did* get there, and then they said, frankly and openly, that the teaching at Mercersburg led them step by step thitherward. And when now the opponents of Mercersburg pointed to these confessions (Geo. D. Wolff's confession, for instance), the professors et al. raise the *mordio* cry of: Our opponents (Dr. B. et al.) are 'leagued with the perverts'—'Wolff writes articles *for* the anti-Liturgical men,' etc. I confess to you,

dear brother, that such disingenuous treatment, even of *my opponents* as well as theirs, is more than I could stand, and made me hesitate—falter. I now concluded to examine more closely into the merits of the general question at issue, to endeavor to get, if possible, to the bottom of things. I said to myself, You have not *studied* these subjects as you should have done; you have taken things on trust. And I had not fairly gotten into the matter before my paper brought me the bold—I feel like saying *daring*—attacks upon the most precious and consoling truth in the Christian system, and which is so fully and clearly set forth in our Catechism. You know to what I refer,—to the doctrine of the Atonement. . . .

"On further reading, I found that the same antagonism had also been shown against other cardinal truths,—justification by faith, for instance; but not so boldly, more negatively than positively. I began now also to understand the frequent thrusts, innuendoes, and slighting remarks in regard to the *Scriptures* (making an 'idol of them,' and saying that, apart from the living minister (priest), they were of no more account than the Koran!); to *doctrines*, etc., as if they were of very little account; and speaking of others, who believe that they are justified by faith, that they believed in what was 'justification by fancy or feeling,' and more than insinuating that all real inward operations of the mind were *shams* in a religious way,—the experimental piety, in other words, 'of reigning Protestantism' was branded as a 'false spiritualism,' as 'Phrygian Montanism,' ranting, demented 'fanaticism'—as an order of 'nature,'—in short, *bad* as Sinbad the Sailor. . . .

"My heart is full as I write. I think of the glorious truths which you and I have preached, and without which we would not know what preaching was for, or of what worth it was. I think of the dying Christian whom I have seen clasping these truths to his heart as the only balm for his spirit, the only cordial for his fears. I think of the blessed martyrs, not only in Apostolic times, but in later centuries, who, rather than bow down and worship saint and crucifix, chose rather to go to the stake or the fire, warmed within and armed for the ordeal by the *experimental truth* of Christ and Him crucified as a living

power in their hearts; and I rose up from my study-chair, and, whilst pacing the room in the dead silence of night, I solemnly vowed to be bound by personal and social ties no longer in this matter, but, if need be, brave the unfriendly looks of some otherwise dear brethren; for truth is higher than friendship.

"For at least ten years had I waited to find out where exactly those new views would lead us,—ten years trying to understand these brethren, fondly hoping, like not a few others, that the fog would clear away and bring us a brighter day. But the day came not. 'You do not understand them,' had been iterated and reiterated until I became wearied with the phrasing. I said at last, 'Why cannot Dr. Nevin and his pupils write in such a manner that intelligent men *can* understand them?' We can understand Neander (awkwardly as he often did express himself). We can understand Hengstenberg, and De Wette, and Ebrard, and Dorner, and Nitzsch, and Hodge. We can understand the teaching of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Apostles. Why, then, after a practice of more than twenty years, can these men not write so that other mortals can understand them? If a man has something to say and wants others to know it (without any reserve on his part), he generally can make himself understood. It is said not to be learning, but the *want* of learning, that renders men unintelligible. Dr. Hodge had to say of his old friend Dr. Nevin (on the appearance of the latter's introduction to Dr. Schaff's 'Principles of Protestantism,' and that was as long ago as A.D. 1845), that he found it difficult to understand him. Surely, if such a man could not, it is not to be wondered at if men of ordinary calibre cannot. If a preacher of the gospel cannot make himself understood, it is usually said, either that the truth is not clear to his own mind, or that he does not venture to speak out courageously what is in him. Is it not so?

"But I think that of late we *do* understand these men tolerably well. When the articles on 'Early Christianity,' 'Cyprian,' etc., appeared, Dr. Nevin was merely attacking the *form* of Protestantism, pulling down, ignoring (I cannot help being reminded of '*Ich bin der Geist der stets verneint*'); then came the attack against the 'Sects' (Dr. Schaff called it '*eine Sektenschlacht*'), harsh, bitter, as if the pen had

been dipped in bitter fluid: so I thought when I first read it, with all my respect for the writer. Such thoughts as these came into my mind: Doctor, who gives thee authority to strike thy fellow-servant, redeemed by the precious blood of the same Saviour? Is it not the spirit of the two disciples whom the Divine Master rebuked for calling down fire upon their fellow-sinners? And then, art not thou a sectarist thyself? Where is thy apostolical succession, unbroken down to this present? And where is thy '*Church*' ? . . . Then came the tinkering with the 80th Question of the Catechism, which also at that time affected me adversely. It was pronounced 'unfortunate' that the 'mass' should be called an 'idolatry,' and of course all 'we boys' took up the refrain, according to the German couplet,—

'*Wie die Alten sungen*
Zwitschern die Jungen.'

Next the 'Creed' had to be tinkered; the Greek word *hades* must be put in the place of *hell*. *Cui bono?* The universal Church, Catholic and Protestant, have used this last term. Every intelligent layman knew its import. Who gave, moreover, a few men the authority to produce a dissonance in the repeating of the Creed? A synodical president must tell us, too, that the Reformers went too far in their work, etc., etc. . . .

"Now, my dear brother, all these things have been much on my mind; and, to bring the matter to the point which is the aim of this long epistle, let me say that I regard it as the duty of *some one* to speak forth calmly, but decidedly and intelligibly, so that all may understand *what are the doctrines of the Church and what are not.* And I have it in my mind to say, you are the person. Your age and experience, your former position as a public man, and your known conservatism, seem to single you out before others to do just this work. Besides, although you were the first man who, twenty odd years ago, sounded the first 'bugle-blast,' as 'Irenæus' lately told us in the *Messenger*, yet you have not taken any part, so far as I know, in the controversies for years. You are known, moreover, to have been the friend personally of our professors; known to have first mentioned, and had proposed through another, the name of Dr. Nevin as professor in our seminary

(prompted by your 'better half'), as the lamented Rev. John Cares in his lifetime said, who during the special Synod in Chambersburg was an eye-witness of the fact in your own house. Then, too, you have, so far as I know, no reason to be dissatisfied with the Church's treatment of yourself; for she has in her time loaded you with a considerable share of duties and onerous burdens, which some men would perhaps count as so much honor. All this and more, it seems to me, fits you for this needed work, whether it be agreeable to you or not. Remember, dear brother, that the path of duty is not always the path of self-choice or of pleasure. Think of what I say, and do as God may seem to bid you. I refrain from a peroration. But this one thing I will yet add, which I omitted to say in the right place: you have no prejudices against you of any moment, for the reasons already stated, neither can you be accused of seeking 'your own' in coming before the public. *You* have no ambition to gratify, no personal animosities to cherish or avenge. To you many will listen who would not listen to others, because these have aroused prejudices against themselves by their active participation in controversy, to which I firmly believe they were *not* led by unhallowed motives. But my sheets are full, and you are weary. God direct you, bless you! . . . .

"_____ _____."

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Introductory Remarks	9
What does Mercersburg Theology teach?	14
The Catechism teaches differently	20
The Doctrine of Atonement	21
Justification by Faith	43
The Priesthood.—Are Ministers Priests?	58
Universal Priesthood of Believers	71
The Opposite View in the Mercersburg Theory	75
Confession and Absolution	83
Purgatory	86
Altar and Sacrifice	89
Altar-Liturgy inconsistent with our Genius and Customs	105
The Sacraments	114
1. Baptism	123
Deliverance from the Power of the Devil	124
Clinical Baptism (*Nothtaufe*)	127
2. The Lord's Supper	129

APPENDICES.

A.

The First Ten Thousand Dollar Gift	147

B.

What the New Theory claims to hold	149
Regeneration. By Dr. Hodge	152

C.

Justification and Sanctification	154

D.

No Human Confessors (Dr. Ryle)	155
The Cross of Christ (Dr. Luthardt)	156

E.

PAGE
Confirmation does not complete Baptism (Dr. Luthardt) . . 157

F.

The Office of the Ministry (Dr. Schwartz) 157
The Church in the Old and New Testament (Neander) . . 158

G.

How the New Theory has led to Rome 159

H.

Notes on the Gospel of John. By Dr. Schaff 160

I.

The Roman Catholic System. By Dr. Dorner 166

J.

Divine Worship in Two Congregations 173
Luther's Experience in Rome 173
Progress of Ritualism 175
How the Leaven works 176
The Use of the Liturgy in Congregations 177
Infant Baptism 180
Sacerdotal Absolution 180
Going Backwards 182
The "Defects" of the Evangelical Alliance 184
The Best Mode of Counteracting Modern Infidelity . . . 186
Christ Incarnate if Man had not sinned 188

MERCERSBURG THEOLOGY.

THAT the Reformed (German) Church in the United States has been greatly disturbed for twenty years past with theological controversy, is well known, not only throughout the length and breadth of the Church, but also outside of its communion. It is equally well known that the cause, as well as the starting-point, of this most unfortunate controversy, has been the promulgation of certain new philosophical and theological speculations, which were taught in our Eastern literary and theological institutions. Beginning with one-sided and highly-exaggerated attacks on "Modern Protestantism," the movement has culminated in the adoption and teaching, by its originators and their disciples, of doctrines and usages entirely at variance with evangelical Protestantism in general, and the Reformed Church in particular.

Into the merits or demerits of these new speculations it is not the design of these pages to enter at length. Those who wish to do so

will find them defended with more or less clearness in the *Mercersburg Review* and the *Reformed Church Messenger*, and opposed by Dr. Bomberger's *Reformed Church Monthly*, the *Christian World*, of Cincinnati, and, to some extent also, the Western Church paper, *Der Evangelist* (in German), but especially Dr. Dorner's able criticism.

The main design of these pages is an honest attempt to show: What are the fundamental doctrines of the Reformed Church according to the Heidelberg Catechism, and the teachings of standard writers from the Reformation down to the present time, in regard to the points in dispute. Reference will also be made to other Churches of the Reformation in the sixteenth century, for the purpose of showing to the general reader that, on all the essential points under consideration, the entire Protestant Church at that period was in accord, substantially, with the Reformed Church. Comparing these teachings of the general Protestant Church—but especially those of the Reformed—with the new system which is attempting to push aside and strangle the old, it will not be difficult, as the writer believes, to see the wide departure from the old, evangelical, sound, and outspoken system of the Reformed Church as it was in the beginning, and from which we have no reason to depart.

Whilst it is deeply to be deplored that so much controversy has been provoked by the new system referred to, threatening sometimes to rend the Church, and in many ways producing disastrous results in our communion, yet it has necessarily led to earnest inquiry into the original history and polity of the Reformed Church on the part of many ministers, who, except for this disturbing element, would not be "rooted and grounded" as fully as they are in the blessed truths for which our fathers lived, and prayed, and died, many of them indeed amid the tortures of the rack, and the agonies of the burning pile kindled by Romish persecution.

One portion of the Church claims that the new views which for twenty years past have been taught in our Eastern College and Seminary are irreconcilable with our Catechism and with evangelical Protestantism, to which they profess to cling with full purpose of heart. The other portion admits that the theology which they hold rests in an "entirely different style of religious thought" from that of their opponents, whom they call the "anti-liturgical and unchurchly party." They not only admit, but affirm, that these two views are "two different versions of the gospel," yea, "*two gospels arrayed against each other, so that the one must look upon the other as wrong and false.*"

Now, as this is admitted to be the fact on both sides, it is necessarily a life-question for the Reformed Church: *Who is right, and who wrong?* If the new system of thought as first taught by Dr. Nevin, and afterwards and now taught by others and held by many of their pupils, is according to and consistent with evangelical Protestantism, and, as a part of it, with the clearly-defined doctrines of the Reformed Church, then they should be allowed all freedom to promulgate them, and all clamor should cease. Nay, further, if some philosophical and even theological speculations were held by these men which did not in all respects square with individual views of the other side, and even with those of standard authors of former times, but which were not of the nature of *essentials*, or which did not run counter to the doctrines of the Heidelberg Catechism, even then there should not be felt any ground for serious alarm. The Reformed Church has ever been regarded, even by those outside of her communion, as the most liberal and generous branch of the Reformation. And undoubtedly she has deserved that character, and may she ever deserve it.

But, on the other hand, if the new system of thought affects, fundamentally and essentially, the Reformed system of truth as this was held by the Reformers and laid down in our acknowl-

edged standards—if it is true that the new system is inconsistent with that which has always been held by evangelical Protestantism from the beginning—if it is true that they *are* "different versions of the gospel, yea, two gospels arrayed against each other,"—then it is high time for us all to know it; yea, high time that every member of the Reformed Church should know it.

The writer of these pages desires carefully and conscientiously to compare these two different gospels which are "arrayed against each other," without partiality and guile. If he fails in any respect to do this as perfectly as could be desired, the readers may rest assured that he himself feels, far more than they can, the imperfection of the effort, and that he will be heartily glad if some abler pen shall perform the work more perfectly and with greater clearness and force.

WHAT DOES THE SO-CALLED MERCERSBURG THEOLOGY TEACH?

In answering this question, we shall not attempt to enter at any length on the subject. These pages are intended rather for the people than for ministers. Still it is thought necessary to give some general statements, taken from the writings of Dr. Nevin and those who hold his views, in order to see what the source is from which result the changed sentiments on the Person and Work of Christ, on Baptism, the Lord's Supper, Regeneration, Faith, Repentance, and correlated truths. What, then, does the Mercersburg theology teach? What are its professed peculiarities?

The theology of Mercersburg starts, so we are told, with the *incarnation* as its central principle. The redemption and final salvation of the world, according to its teaching, is not accomplished by moral means (moral in the highest Christian sense), but by an organic union of the Incarnate Word with humanity, *as a whole*, and this in order to form a basis for the regeneration of the *race*. It is carried for-

ward "by an organic union of the race with the Incarnate Word," this Incarnate Word being developed and transmitted by an organic or historical process. Reference is, indeed, made to the doctrines of the atonement, justification by grace through faith, and also to repentance. But these are secondary, and by the way, to the important Christological (called also the organic "Christocentric") scheme. They are not properly of a fundamental character, only in so far as they may be the means of preparing the way for the effectual working of this organic process. We quote these words from Dr. Nevin, which he employs in summing up a series of articles:

"The principle of Christianity is Christ; not any attribute, office, or ministry of Christ simply; not any doctrine, doing, or suffering of Christ; but the mediatorial Person of Christ, through which only room is made for His mediation in any other view."

Dr. Nevin, and others of his way of thinking, charge those who do not fall in with their system that they deny that redemption flows from the mediatorial person of Christ, and that they consider His work as sundered, apart, and distinct from His person.

This charge is not well founded. Where, we may boldly ask, is this sundering of the work from the person of Christ taught? Surely not

in any of the Evangelical Confessions—not in the Reformed Church, nor is it held by any minister of our Church, so far as we have ever heard.

But the vital departure of the Mercersburg theology from the theology of Protestant and Reformed Churches lies in the question, What is the *nature* of the relation between Christ and the redemption? That the Lord Jesus Christ is the Life, as well as the Light, of His people, and consequently of the Church; that He is the Alpha and Omega, the source and fountain of all spiritual life, is a precious truth, and one which evangelical theology, and with it our Heidelberg Catechism, holds and teaches with the utmost clearness and precision.

But the question is,—

How is Christ vitally related to His people?

We will let Dr. Nevin speak for himself, gathering his statements together in as nearly a connected form as we can. He says,—

It is by "an organic conjunction with the Saviour," "in a way that makes Him to be the actual life-principle of their (believers) new Christian being, and shows their life to be mysteriously involved in His from its commencement to its close. The regeneration in which all starts, and the resurrection in which all at last becomes complete, are substantially one and the same process; which is viewed also,

at the same time, as proceeding throughout from the glorified life of the Saviour Himself." "It is a new creation, which, as such, cannot start from those who are the subjects of it, but must come from the fundamental regeneration of humanity that is brought to pass, first of all, in the Word made flesh." "The mystery of the incarnation exhibited in the living Christ is the fundamental principle and beginning of the whole Christian salvation." "The Word Incarnate is the root and origin of the entire new creation, no less fully than He is to be considered as being, before He became man, the producing cause of the old creation." "The organic view of Christianity underlies the true idea of the Church." "In this view, of course, Christ becomes at once for faith the root of all Christianity and the fountain of the universal Christian life out to the resurrection of the last day. He is THE SECOND ADAM. That, of itself, gives us the whole thought, and causes us to feel the vital character of the relation that holds between Him and His people." "The process starts in the mystery of our Saviour's holy incarnation." "Christianity (therefore) is a new world of grace, a new order of life, which is comprehended primarily in the (incarnate) person of Christ, and which starts forth from Him as its original principle and root."

Now, what does Dr. Nevin mean by these declarations? And before we give their natural and obvious meaning, it is well to remember that he does not *pretend* to hold the Reformed

view on this subject,—as we shall see hereafter, —for he says, openly and frankly, he "cannot endure" it. What then is his peculiar theory?

Why, most clearly this, that men are not saved through the sufferings and death of Christ, the Crucified One, but by the actual, literal, substantial conveyance to believers of the very substance of the life of Christ incarnate. Christ in His theanthropic (divine human) person is as literally and substantially the ground, the fountain-head of the new life of believers, as the natural Adam is of their natural life. *The personal regeneration of believers starts in and flows from the general regeneration of humanity, in and by the incarnation of the Son of God, the Word.*

Denying then that the redemption of men is accomplished or the work of the atonement secured through Christ's holy life and propitiatory sacrifice on the cross (*i.e.*, through His active and passive vicarious satisfaction), this new theory holds that we are saved by the conveyance to us of this regenerated humanity in the incarnate Word, through certain outward channels (the visible Church, Ordination, Baptism, Confirmation, etc.). The least candor must admit that this is a very mechanical and outward theory; that it is very different from that which has always been held as true in the Reformed Church, and from what the Scriptures seem to

teach so very plainly, and that it does by no means correspond with the experience of God's people in all ages.

It is not necessary, nor is it our purpose, to pursue our inquiries on the main point any further in regard to the new theory, that the incarnation and not the death of Christ is held to be the fountain of salvation as well as the fountain of all the peculiar teachings of that school. This follows as a necessary consequence. If the incarnation of Christ is the central doctrine of the system, it must follow also, as Dr. Ruetenik has well observed, that if the unprofitable question were to be asked, whether Christ would have become man if Adam had not sinned, the answer from Nevin and his disciples would be, Yes. And why? Because Christ's sacrificial death was not the aim of His incarnation; it was merely an event—a necessary event—in the process of His life. But the Scriptures everywhere imply that the incarnation was merely a means—a necessary step to the atonement, just as a seed, in order to grow and ripen, must be placed into the ground.

Now let the reader turn to the 16th question of our Catechism, where it is asked why it was necessary for Christ to be very man, and also perfectly righteous. The answer is given in these words:

"Because the justice of God requires that the same human nature, which hath sinned, should likewise make satisfaction for sin; and one who is himself a sinner cannot satisfy for others." (See also the proof-texts quoted under the answer.)

Here then we have our Catechism teaching most explicitly, with the Holy Scriptures, that the incarnation was necessary, because Christ could not otherwise have *suffered death for the human race.* The same Catechism teaches that He "bore in body and soul the wrath of God against the sins of all mankind; that so *by His passion*, as the only propitiatory sacrifice, He might redeem our body and soul from everlasting damnation." (Quest. 37.) It makes the solemn, clear, and unequivocal declaration, that the "Holy Ghost teaches us in the gospel, and assures us by the sacraments, that the *whole of our salvation depends upon that one sacrifice of Christ, which He offered for us on the cross.*" (Quest. 67.) And in that notable 80th question (which not a few have desired to be expunged because it is an honest and decided protest against the Romish mass) we are told that "the Lord's Supper testifies to us that we have a full pardon of all sin by the only sacrifice of Jesus Christ, which He has once accomplished on the cross."

In all candor it may be asked just here, Can any truth be stated with greater clearness and precision? And it may be asked further, Is not this the Protestant doctrine to which millions of the departed dead and the living have clung and are clinging as their greatest comfort in life and death? Is it not this truth which is put into the mouth of the believer in that precious first answer of the Catechism where he is asked What is thy only comfort in life and death? and responds in these words: "That I with body and soul, both in life and death, am not my own, but belong unto my faithful Saviour Jesus Christ, *who with His precious blood hath fully satisfied for all my sins*, and delivered me from all the power of the devil," etc.

It would be easy to show that this cardinal truth in the gospel system, as taught in our confession of faith, rests on the obvious teaching of the word of God, of which such a passage as 1 Peter i. 18, 19 gives the key-note: "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, . . . but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot." But this is not what we are called upon to do; for, as ministers and members of the Reformed Church, our acknowledged standard of truth is the Heidelberg Catechism.

As ministers, we have subscribed to it and solemnly vowed to preach that truth; as professors, to teach it; as members, to believe it. All that is needed then just now, all that is contemplated in this little work, is to prove that the new system of Mercersburg-Lancaster is *not* in accordance with the system of truth as held by the Reformed Church, and as it is clearly laid down in the Heidelberg Catechism, and as held and taught by the Reformers and all acknowledged expounders and theological teachers of the Church.

We have seen what is the unmistakable teaching of the Catechism. Now let us see whether the obvious sense of its teaching is borne out by other testimony of undoubted force and authority.

And first, we will appeal to Ursinus, one of the authors of the Heidelberg Catechism. He wrote a commentary on the Catechism, which was translated into English some years ago by the Rev. Dr. Williard, President of Heidelberg College, in Tiffin, Ohio. No authority can be equal to that of the learned and good author of that book when the question concerns the *sense and meaning* in which that inimitable text-book is to be understood. In the introduction to the English translation referred to, Dr. Nevin says, "No other [work] can have the same weight as

an exposition of its true meaning." Let us then hear how he understood the Catechism.

In his explanation of the first answer in the Catechism, in treating of the "comfort" of a believer in Christ, Ursinus says that this comfort consists, first, of "our reconciliation with God through Christ;" and then, as to the *manner* of it, he says that "our reconciliation (is) with God *through the blood of Christ*, that is, *through His passion, death*, and satisfaction for our sins." 1 Peter i. 18; 1 John i. 7. (*Comment.*, p. 18.)

In explaining the phrase "to eat the crucified body and to drink the shed blood of Christ," which occurs in the 76th question, he says,—

"The eating of the body and the drinking of the blood of Christ is not corporal, but spiritual, and embraces:

"1. Faith in His sufferings and death.

"2. The forgiveness of sins, and the gift of eternal life through faith.

"3. Our union with Christ through the Holy Spirit, who dwells both in Christ and in us.

"4. The quickening influence of the same Spirit. Hence, to eat the crucified body and to drink the shed blood of Christ, is to believe that God receives us into His favor for the sake of Christ's merits; that we obtain the remission of our sins and reconciliation with God by the same faith." (p. 382.)

This is the Protestant, this is the Reformed

teaching as to the way and manner in which fallen men are saved, not by an "organic process" which starts in "the mystery" of Christ's incarnation, by which humanity, in some way not clearly stated, becomes regenerated, and which is said to be "the fundamental principle and beginning of the whole Christian salvation," or, as it is sometimes stated, by the actual, literal, substantial conveyance "of the very substance of the life of Christ incarnate." No; the Catechism, and indeed the entire evangelical Protestant Church, knows nothing of the Christian salvation brought about by any process so physical as this new theory seems to teach. It is to the *redemption of Christ accomplished on the* CROSS, and secured to the penitent believer *by faith*, not to the incarnation process, that we are directed for salvation.

This is the doctrine which was taught by all the Reformers and by all accepted writers and preachers of the Reformed Church in Europe and America,—Zwingle and Calvin, and the whole line of godly men who adorn the page of Church history. The former says, "There is, therefore, but one way to become reconciled to God, and that way is through Jesus and Him crucified. It is by preaching Christ on the cross that men are drawn to God, thus fulfilling the word of Jesus: And I, if I be lifted up, will

draw all men after me." Calvin says, "The sinner, coming in contrition to the Saviour, finds in Him and in His finished work of redemption on the cross just what he needs, and this is what affords him hope and comfort."

And, coming to the present age, we hear the same harmonious testimony from the lips of God's honored servants. It is needless to multiply quotations. But let us hear the testimony of a man whose name is loved and honored in America as it is in Europe, and who cannot be accused of being unsound to the confession of the Reformed Church. I mean Dr. F. W. Krummacher. It is from his address of welcome to the members of the Evangelical Alliance in Berlin in 1857. The whole eloquent and spirited address is a noble testimony of his oneness with true Christians who hold to Christ the Head as the "All and in All." After saying, as if in the name of all those who were then before him, that they bowed to the Holy Scriptures as the Divine infallible revelation given from God, and that no other can be believed in, whether it be called reason or tradition, hierarchy or church, or by whatever other name it may be known, nor that any can stand above it, and affirming the declaration of faith in the triune God, the lost and sinful state of man, etc., he proceeds to say,—

"But we also comfort ourselves with the joyful assurance that this great grace has appeared in Jesus Christ, who is God manifest in the flesh; and in His mediatorial work we see the only but the all-sufficient cause of our salvation and of our everlasting happiness. *We take hold of Christ by faith;* we do Him honor; with body and soul we give ourselves to Him; and thus we conclude, that though we are sinful, miserable, and guilty in ourselves, we stand justified before the Judge of the living and the dead, not on account of our faith as a virtue, much less on account of our good works, but solely for the righteousness of the Great Surety, which is reckoned as grace to those who *have faith in Him who justifies the ungodly.* On account of the merits of Jesus, the Holy Ghost declares us in our conscience free from sin, gives witness with our spirit that we are the children of God, fills us with that peace which passeth all understanding, and continues in us that work of sanctification which He has already begun in us."

The same Krummacher holds the following language in a sermon on the "Cross of Christ:"

"*Christ the Mediator!* Touched with gratitude, I give Him, the Crucified One, my full confidence; and after having taken my place as the *Mediator*, He now becomes also my *Redeemer* and *Saviour.* For His sake I have been absolved from all the guilt of sin. Now He also breaks the dominion of sin *in me*, by giving me His Holy Spirit, making me a partaker of His nature, and

thus brings about a new mode of life well pleasing to God. I now do not live any more unto myself, but unto *Him*, who has *purchased me with His blood*." . . . "The cross, with its sweet tones of invitation, and at the same time its solemn admonitions to repentance—yes, the cross, with the suffering, dying Lamb of God upon it—the *cross* is the *centre of the gospel*."

This clear testimony from the able court-preacher of Prussia and the loved favorite of the late king, now with God, is essentially different from the theory which makes the *incarnation* the "*centre* of Christianity." Krummacher, it cannot be doubted, was soundly Reformed, Evangelical, and Protestant. Whoever was Rationalist, certainly *he* was not. And the utterances in the opening address, above referred to, were heard by hundreds of the choicest spirits from all parts of the Christian Church with unanimous accord,—the leading men of the Evangelical Church of Germany, England, France, Switzerland, Scotland, and elsewhere,—as with one voice they proclaimed their faith in Christ crucified, as the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world. And need it be said that the same truth has been held in the same way by all sound Protestants, not only in Europe, but also in this country, and by none more emphatically than by the ministry of the Reformed Church, among

the dead and the living? Among the former we recall such men as Schlatter and the two Drs. Hendel, Otterbein, and Fries; Dr. S. Helfenstein, Jon. Helfenstein, and Reiley, Runkel, Dr. Becker, and D. Wagner; Drs. Mayer and Bibighaus; Drs. Pomp and Hoffeditz; P. Pauli and Vandersloot, Sr.; Thomas Winters, Sr., and Gloninger; Drs. A. Helfenstein and Zacharias; W. Hiester and the Rahausers; the earnest Beecher and the devoted Rice; Smaltz and Leinbach; Gutelius and the two Fishers; I. Gerhart and the lovely Cares; Dr. Heiner, H. Wagner, and Dr. Rauch* (the first President of Marshall College), Dr. Hoffmeier, and by scores of others.

BUT WHO DENIES THIS DOCTRINE?

It may perhaps be said that no one denies this truth, and hence the proofs furnished are a fruitless and unnecessary labor. Let us see how this is. Instead of selecting paragraphs and single sentences from numerous articles by

* Out of a number of quotations from Dr. Rauch's sermons, let the following serve as a specimen on this subject: "Had Christ not been crucified, the kingdom of truth and of love would never have been established on earth. He died, not because He *could not* shun the malice of the Jews, but *that He might reconcile the world to God;* and the Father makes use of their arm to slay Him *whose pure and innocent blood was to be the ransom for our sins.* Now the sinner is justified by faith without the deeds of the law."—*The Inner Life*, edited by Dr. E. V. Gerhart, 1856, p. 152.

various writers in the *Mercersburg Review*, and the *Messenger*, in which the opposite truth is taught, we have an article on this very subject in the *Messenger* of September 17, 1873, from one of the professors in Lancaster, which is clear and outspoken; it could not be more so. The title of the article is, "The Doctrine of the Catechism concerning the Atoning Death of Christ."

The writer sees and feels the force of the language employed in the Catechism touching this subject. He admits, in fact, that it requires one to understand its words in a sense which he does not wish them to have. Here is the introductory paragraph:

"A superficial study of the Heidelberg Catechism may make the impression that the atoning sacrifice of Christ accomplished on the cross is not only essential, but also fundamental and principial, in its doctrinal system of redemption. It teaches, that Christ 'bore in body and soul the wrath of God against the sin of the whole human race, in order that by His passion, as the only atoning sacrifice, He might redeem our body and soul from everlasting damnation' (Q. 37); that the sacrifice of Jesus Christ on the cross is the only ground of our salvation, and that 'our whole salvation stands in the one sacrifice of Christ, made for us on the cross' (Q. 67). Again, the Catechism says 'that we have full forgiveness of all our sins by the one

sacrifice of Jesus Christ' (Q. 80). Many other expressions occur, which are equally explicit."

But why now is it said that the "*superficial* study of the Heidelberg Catechism" makes such an impression? Have all the theologians, and all the millions of pious people, learned and unlearned, for hundreds of years past, been nothing but "superficial readers"? What other "impression" upon the minds of the devout readers sf that Catechism could by any possibility be made, than "that the atoning sacrifice of Christ accomplished on the cross" *is* essential and fundamental? That any Protestant teacher of theology, and especially one in the Reformed Church, should ever have received any *other* impression, is most marvellous.

But let us hear him further:

"That this doctrinal system underlies and animates the Heidelberg Catechism we cannot believe."

"We cannot believe"! He cannot believe it, although the entire Protestant Church—yea, we might say, even the Roman Catholic Church—at least in a formal way—has always held to the truth, and the Heidelberg Catechism unmistakably teaches it, so that even the professor admits that the obvious language of this book makes the impression upon the reader to that effect.

And why can he not believe it, then? Here are his reasons:

"The notion is incompatible with the central position of the Creed; incompatible also with its conception of the gospel, as an order of grace standing in the personal history of Jesus Christ."

Here we have the frank avowal that the "notion" (only a notion) of the atoning sacrifice of Christ, as previously stated, "is incompatible with the central position of the (so-called) Apostles' Creed;" and, further, "incompatible also with its conception of the gospel, as an order of grace standing in the personal history of Jesus Christ."

This is not a very clear statement, to be sure. But any one who has carefully read the new (Mercersburg) theology sees at a glance what it means. It means that men are not saved by the atoning sacrifice of Christ, but by *participating* in the *divine-human life of Christ.* In other words, we are saved by the "actual, literal, substantial conveyance to us" of the very substance of the life of Christ incarnate, and that redemption, as applied and effected, does not flow from "Christ and Him crucified" (for this is said to be only a mode, means, or condition of the process), but from the *incarnation.* To the Creed is given a peculiar meaning—a

purely fanciful, subjective theory, and, with this construction put upon it by the new theology, it is made to give the key-note to all that is embraced under the name of Christianity. Virtually, it is placing the Creed above the written gospel. Now then we see plainly enough that the reason why the Lancaster professor cannot believe in what he is pleased to call the "notion" of the Catechism (and the word of God as well), is because it will not fit in with the new philosophical and theological system to which he holds. Nay, it is antagonistic to it from every point of view. It is altogether "another gospel," starting in and "flowing from the general regeneration of humanity in and by the incarnation of the Son of God, the Word." This is called a process, an "historical process." By means of it we are saved, according to this new theory, not by Christ's passion and death, appropriated by faith, but by participating in the theanthropic or divine-human nature of Christ, a view which the learned Dr. Dorner calls "a manufactured theory which cannot support itself by the Holy Scriptures."*

The method which the writer referred to employs to sustain his position that the Catechism cannot and does not teach what it seems to do,

* Dr. Dorner's "Liturgical Conflict in the Reformed Church of America," 1868.

is a very lame and far-fetched one. He says the emphasis which it lays on the sacrifice of Christ was intended rather as an opposition to the "contrary errors of the Roman Church. The sacrifice of Christ is opposed to the sacrifice of the mass; and the infinite merit of His sacrifice to the supposed merit obtained by monastic vows, arbitrary penance, and self-inflicted bodily pains."

To this unheard-of, pointless, and unnatural assertion, which contains the very embodiment of its own weakness, let it be remarked:

1. That the Catechism does not furnish the most remote foundation for such an assertion in the passages referred to, except in the 80th Question, which was *intended* to be a testimony against the Romish mass, not by "implication," but directly, positively. But so far as the 37th and 67th Questions are concerned, it is utterly futile to draw from them any other sense or meaning than what the clear, obvious words teach. There they stand, and no turning and twisting can make anything else out of them.

2. The other remark is, that if the meaning of the Catechism is different, by implication, at least, from what it seems to be, is it not strange that that meaning was never discovered before? For more than three hundred years has that precious little work been regarded as containing

one of the clearest expositions of divine truth, outside of the Bible, the Church has ever possessed. Its compact yet full teachings on the doctrine of redemption, the atonement by Christ, and its application to the believer, have been held and believed, have ever been preached and expounded, in accordance with the obvious, plain meaning of its language. Hundreds of commentaries have been written on the Catechism in Germany, Holland, and America, and not one of the writers ever discovered that the Catechism did not mean just precisely what it taught. What no one of them was learned enough to find out, has been, however, discovered at this late day, as it would seem! The entire Protestant Church has so understood it, has indorsed it, and the Reformed Church has gloried in it. No Reformed minister or theologian, of any standing or character, ever held the view that the Catechism taught anything else than that the sacrifice of Christ on the cross "was essential, fundamental, and principial in its doctrinal system of redemption." Was there ever a breath to the contrary uttered in our Church, even twenty or twenty-five years ago? Did not Dr. Nevin himself write a little book in commendation of the Catechism? and did not the Reformed Church in Germany and in this country unite in celebrating the three

hundredth anniversary of the Catechism, without ever intimating, in any of the addresses, essays, and speeches, that the teachings of that book were not properly apprehended, or that what *seemed* to teach this cardinal truth was a mere antithesis against some of the errors of the Roman Church? Never! No, *never!*

But let us hear again what the author of the article in the *Messenger* says, for the purpose of turning the point against those who believe differently from himself:

"When the Catechism emphasizes the exclusive efficacy of Christ's death," he says, "the implied opposition does not pertain to any other cardinal fact in His history. His death is not opposed to His birth on the one side, or His resurrection on the other. It does not inculcate the idea that the only ground of salvation is the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, not His conception and birth, not His resurrection and glorification; as if the life were not as necessary as the death of Christ, and His exaltation and glory as necessary as His humiliation."

Let us ask the writer of the foregoing two sentences whether he can point out any one in the Reformed Church who ever taught or held that the Catechism implied any opposition to His birth or resurrection, or any other cardinal fact in Christ's history. Opposition! There is no opposition in the case. Who, it may be asked,

ever said that Christ's death was opposed to His birth, on the one side, or His resurrection, on the other? It might be interesting to know.

But when the writer says that the Catechism "does not inculcate the idea that the only ground of salvation is the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, not His conception and birth, etc.," we must ask him what right he has to presuppose any opposition to the conception and birth, resurrection and glorification of Christ. The Catechism in the Question referred to (37) treats of the "only ground of our salvation." It says that the "Holy Ghost teaches us in the gospel, and assures us by the sacraments, that the whole of our salvation depends upon that one sacrifice of Christ, which He offered for us on the cross." Here the Catechism does indeed say what the professor denies, that the *only ground of our salvation* depends on the sacrifice of Christ, but it does not imply that the birth and resurrection were not essential, antecedent, and consequent facts to the vicarious death of Christ. St. Paul says, "God forbid that I should glory, *save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ*" (Gal. vi. 14). St. John says, "The blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin" (1 John i. 8). Do these and other like declarations of God's

holy word imply any opposition, or even a slighting of the birth and resurrection of Christ? Just as much, and no more, than does the Catechism.*

It is then not in the atonement as something separate and apart from Christ's person and work in any form, but in Christ as born, risen, crucified, and glorified, that we, with the universal church of Christ, believe. But we do believe also, with the same universal church of Christ, that the sacrifice of Christ on the cross as the culmination, the *crowning fact* of all that went before, "*is* the only ground of our salvation," and "that our whole salvation stands in the one sacrifice of Christ."

It might seem superfluous, in a case so plain and self-evident, to bring forward any more proof. But let us direct attention to one more. It is in the formula of the Lord's Supper as

* To give prominence to the death of Christ on the cross has ever been the glory of evangelical Protestantism, and the want of it has always been regarded as the forerunner, if not the actual present existence, of Rationalism. How strangely does it sound, therefore, to have it said in the editorial columns of our Church paper (Oct. 1, 1873) that "one of the great prevailing wrong tendencies of the day, when speaking of the atonement of Christ, as related to the grand scheme of redemption, is the disposition to give such prominence to the death of Christ on the cross," and then charging that by so doing it "casts into the shade, if it does not exclude, everything else relating to His person and work"! The eminent Dr. Luthardt says, "The central point of the revelation of redemption is the atonement on the cross, the forgiveness of sins."—*Lecture IX. of his works.*

contained in the Palatinate Directory (Heidelberg, A.D. 1563, only three years after the publication of the Heidelberg Catechism), where it is said,—

"From this institution of the Holy Supper of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, we see that He directs our faith and confidence to His perfect sacrifice,—once offered on the cross,—as to the *only ground and foundation of our salvation*, in which He became to our hungry and thirsty souls the true meat and drink of everlasting life."

Yea, verily, the professor is right in saying that the Catechism "emphasizes" this doctrine, and so have all sound theologians from Ursinus down to Krummacher and Dorner. The professor, however, and with him the leaders of the new system of Mercersburg and Lancaster, do *not emphasize*, but, on the contrary, they do not, yea, they "*cannot believe* it." And the reason why they cannot believe it has been stated: namely, their new theory of philosophy and theology has no room for it. It starts out from another principle altogether. In that theory a fusion of the theanthropic or divine-human life of the Word with humanity is the central doctrine, and this rules the whole system of their theology; and in their view there is no such thing as a sacrifice for sin on the cross, as it has

always been held by the evangelical Church.* Just here it is that the new system is unsound to the core, anti-Protestant, and so anti-Reformed. Its friends may endeavor as much as they please to make it appear that the opposing view is held only by "*Puritans, fanatics,*" or, mayhap, by a fraction of "Rationalistic" theologians who know no better. This way of throwing mire on a hated few looks very like a ruse. It is *not* a small fraction, it is *not* some one-sided Puritans and fanatics, nor some modern "unchurchly *sects*,"—Winebrenners or Mormons it might be,—that are meant, merely, although when pressed on this subject they will sometimes point to these as being their "objective point" of attack. But they mean something "broader and deeper" than that. Dr. Nevin speaks out more candidly, and freely admits this, for he tells us that the "reigning theology of Protestantism" is of an altogether different type, it is on an entirely different basis from that of the new theology, it is "another gospel." He says of his theology, that it "rests in a wholly different style of religious thought"

* Thus, Dr. Nevin asserts that the death of Christ on the cross is to be regarded as "a necessary all-glorious mode or condition only of the process" of redemption by His incarnation. The *redemption* of mankind, according to this view, was by the *incarnation*, and not by the death, of Christ.

from that of the other side. Nay, he says that they are two gospels arrayed against each other, so that the one *must* look upon the other as *wrong and false!* (See Appendix B.) And here in this fundamental doctrine of the atonement by the Lord Jesus Christ is the divergence in its beginnings. The new theology starts in the incarnation, and from that develops its peculiar views in such sense as to set aside, or change and modify, *every doctrine of the Christian system.* Not a few "ranting sects," therefore, nor a minority of ministers in this or that denomination, are wrong, according to this new system, but the *entire Protestant Church* of all branches, German, English, and American.*

* We all remember how, some years ago, there was a constant appeal made to German theology as favoring the new Mercersburg system. The writer of these pages once modestly asked an ardent favorer of the new position to what German authors he referred as being in accord with the Mercersburg theology. He did not know any one in particular, was at last his reply, but he thought Tholuck and Krummacher (sic!). In the course of time, however, German theology and its glory had departed, and it was so announced in the most public and pronounced way, and "*Anglican*" (the High Church or Puseyite movement) was declared to be the watchword, although this even does not hold to any such theosophic or rationalistic speculation in regard to the incarnation. This view is, what its friends claim for it, *new*, at least in its application to Christian doctrines in the historical Protestant churches. It is *subjective* in the worst sense of the term, *i.e.* human philosophical speculation carried into the word of God. It is also eminently unhistorical. So also was Swedenborg's speculation new in its day. The learned and well-meaning Count dreamed learnedly and much, but the world has become neither wiser

For nothing is more palpable than that on this doctrine of the atoning sacrifice of Christ all of them are a unit. All hold to it as fundamental to the Christian system, with more or less clearness. Only the leading men of this new theology "cannot believe" it to be such, and they cannot because their system is constructed upon an entirely different theory. According to it there is no room for the atoning sacrifice of Christ as a fundamental article in the doctrinal system of redemption. And although the Heidelberg Catechism (with the whole Protestant evangelical Church) holds to it as with one voice, those brethren cannot believe it, and, more painful than all, they attempt to eviscerate the doctrine and give it an entirely different meaning, pronouncing every one who believes in that precious truth as taught in our symbol and the word of God, a "superficial" reader. Let the bold declaration of a professor in our theological seminary at Lancaster stand out

---

nor better for his philosophic dreams, and few now care to be at the pains to understand them. Dr. Dorner, whom Dr. Nevin claimed as favoring his views (in a speech at the Dayton Synod), regarding his influence as of immense weight to his new theory, and so likewise Dr. Ullmann and Dr. Jul. Müller, have since been cast out as of no account whatever, chiefly, it would seem, because they cannot judge of theology and philosophy from the clogs of a State Church around them! And yet who have spoken more freely and boldly on the freedom of the Church from the State than Dr. Dorner, right under the shadow of the Prussian palace?

clearly before the whole Church, as expressed in his own words:

"*A superficial study of the Heidelberg Catechism may make the impression that the atoning sacrifice of Christ accomplished on the cross is not only essential, but also fundamental and principial, in its doctrinal system of redemption. . . . That this doctrinal system underlies and animates the Heidelberg Catechism* WE CANNOT BELIEVE."

Looking back upon what we have thus far written, we may well ask the question at this point, Shall we allow ourselves to change the entire meaning of the Heidelberg Catechism, and all the Reformed Confessions, and the experience of the best Christians in all ages, and also the clear teachings of Holy Writ, in favor of such a purely human speculative view as this, that when Christ became man He assumed generic humanity and so in principle redeemed humanity? It is in truth a mere assumption, without a particle of proof, that there is such a thing as "generic humanity." It is furthermore a pure assumption, without a particle of proof, that Christ assumed generic humanity. It is, in the third place, a pure supposition, without any proof at all, that Christ's assumption of humanity was a redemption of man. The Scriptures point to the cross as the redemption. Thus this system is brought into being by piling

assumption upon assumption: so unstable is it in its foundation. But worst of all, as we have shown, it entirely changes the gospel of salvation. Can any one point out an example in the New Testament where an apostle, or any other convert, bases his hope and certainty of salvation upon any such basis as this? "God forbid," says Paul, "that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Gal. vi. 14). The same Paul, thrice in a single chapter (Col. i. 14, 19, 20), emphasizes the true doctrine as follows: "It pleased the Father that in Him should all fullness dwell; and, having made peace *through the blood of the cross*, by Him to reconcile all things to Himself." If this new theory prevails, we shall have to re-write not only the Heidelberg Catechism, but the New Testament itself. As that blessed book has been apprehended by the long line of martyrs, confessors, and believers, it gave forth no such sound as that.

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

Another fundamental doctrine of the gospel and of the evangelical Protestant Church, is that of justification by faith. It relates to the question how man comes into possession of the great blessings of the redemption accomplished by Christ. No truth can be of greater importance than the truth which tells him how he may

be just before God, or, in other words, what he must do to be saved. The gospel answer is clear as a sunbeam, and it comes from the lips of inspired apostles: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." It comes from Christ Himself: "Him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out." That it is effective is testified to by all the apostles: "But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name" (John i. 12). "Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. v. 1). And yet this clearly-revealed truth became darkened and overloaded with so much error during the centuries before the Reformation, that it was scarcely understood by one in a thousand. Bodily self-inflictions, penances, going into cloisters away from the outside world, paying money to erect shrines and altars to the saints and the Virgin,—these were some of the ways by which men were to obtain the favor of God and the peace of their consciences. And when in the sixteenth century this system of man had reached its pinnacle, when salvation was literally sold for money by traveling monks (a Tetzel, in Germany, for instance), God raised up men in different countries of Europe to re-announce

the simple teachings of God's Holy Word on this subject. The Reformation proclaimed with clarion voice that the sinner is justified by God freely, and that when he humbly approaches Him he can lay hold of (or believe) the blessed truth that his sins are forgiven for the sake of the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ. This truth the Reformers found in the gospel; they found it sealed to them by the sacraments; they found it witnessed by the Holy Spirit in their personal consciousness, in their own experience. So Luther, so Zwingle, Melanchthon, Calvin, and all the host of great and good men of that period; thus they believed, thus they wrote and preached, and in this faith they died full of hope and peace and joy. When Olevianus, one of the authors of the Heidelberg Catechism, was on his dying bed, and was asked by one whether he was certain of his salvation, he replied by a single word in Latin, "*Certissimus!*" "perfectly sure," and, laying his hand upon his breast, quietly expired. These men of God had read such passages as these in their Bible: "The just shall live by faith." "We have redemption through His blood." "He (Jesus) hath made peace through the blood of His cross." We are justified through the redemption that is in Him. "We are justified in His name." "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved"

(Gal. iii. 11; Eph. i. 7; Rom. iii. 24; 1 Cor. i. 30; Acts xvi. 31).

In perfect accordance with this truth is the teaching of the Heidelberg Catechism, as we shall now prove.

The 21st Question and Answer read as follows:

"What is true faith?

"True faith is not only a certain knowledge, whereby I hold for truth all that God has revealed to us in His word, but also an assured confidence, which the Holy Ghost works by the gospel in my heart; that not only to others, but to me also, remission of sin, everlasting righteousness, and salvation, are freely given by God, merely of grace, only for the sake of Christ's merits."

Faith, therefore, according to the Catechism, consists in *knowledge* and an *assured confidence;* a knowledge of that in which we are to believe, and an application which every one who exercises this faith or confidence makes to himself, that his sin is freely remitted unto him for the sake of Christ's merits. "The *efficient cause* of justifying faith," says Ursinus, "is the Holy Ghost. The *instrumental cause* is the gospel, in which the use of the sacraments is also comprehended. The *subject* of this faith is the will and heart of man."

So much for the Catechism.

Let us now quote only a few other authorities, not the authorized confessions of other evangelical communions, for these, as every one can see, are all in full accord on the subject; but theologians of acknowledged standing in Protestant Christendom.

Dr. Krummacher (Reformed): "The doctrine of justification through the merits of Christ, and received by faith, is the dividing line between the Protestant evangelical and the Roman Church. It is here we obtain that joyful assurance of our salvation, and the consequent peace which flows therefrom. And our own Reformed Church holds and ever has held fast to this truth." *Tholuck* (Lutheran): "When, looking at yourself and within yourself, you feel sad and despondent, then look with penitence and faith ever deeper and deeper into the centre, to Jesus Christ, who of God is made unto us wisdom, righteousness (justification), sanctification, and redemption. Forever will it remain true that we are justified by faith and have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ" (*Gewissenspredigten*, 1860). *Dr. Luthardt* (Lutheran): "The cause of forgiveness (of sins) is in God alone and in His free mercy. It is this which forgives us for the sake of Christ and His redemption. It is through this that God's holiness has made it possible for itself to forgive us. *But it is our faith which lays hold upon this grace*, for it is a faith in the grace of redemption. It is by faith that we obtain for-

giveness, for, as Luther says, 'What thou believest, that thou hast.' Not that the ground of forgiveness lies in our faith, as though it were so meritorious an act, so good a work, that God must reward it; nor in our love which proceeds from faith, nor in our repentance which begets it; it is not in *us*, but only in God and *in the atoning death of Jesus Christ.* It is this which, with the Apostle Paul, we call justification, namely, our acquittal from all guilt and punishment, and our admission to the rights of sonship. Not because we are not sinners, but though we are sinners; nay, just because we are sinners, and believe in His pardoning grace, are we pronounced free, guiltless, and just, and received into favor. Justification, then, is not a change which takes place *in us*, but, if we may so speak, an occurrence which takes place *in God*,—a change in the sentence He passes upon us, in His view of us, in our value in His sight. He chooses to regard and treat us as His children; for the Spirit of God bears witness with our spirits that we are the children of God; bears this witness through the Word of God, which addresses us in those loving terms, My son, my daughter, be of good comfort, thy sins are forgiven thee; thy faith hath made thee whole. Thus does the Spirit, by means of the Word, produce in our hearts the glad, the God-reposed assurance which a Christian must possess, if he is to live and die as a Christian should; for from this alone can grow a happy childlike love to God, a

grateful obedience in life, and a joyful hope in death."*

Dr. Pressensé (the eminent French Reformed divine):

"We never could succeed in weaving a wedding garment such as would allow of our sitting down at our heavenly Father's banquet. We must receive it from the Redeemer's hand; and this robe is His own royal robe, which He has dyed in the crimson of His own blood. We cannot appear before God except as we are clothed in His righteousness. But He will not clothe us in this until we have approached Him with an ardent desire to receive His grace, and until, like the poor daughter of Israel, who met Him one day, we have seized with a trembling hand that holy robe with which we must be covered. In other words, we can only share in His merits through the faith which unites us to Him. What He did for us eighteen hundred years ago is of no value without this faith, this personal adherence, to Him.

* "Saving Truths of Christianity," by Doctor and Professor Luthardt. Translated from the German by Sophia Taylor. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner, Welford & Co., 1868. To students and intelligent laymen no more instructive, interesting, and edifying book can be recommended than this. Its strong arguments are clearly stated; its illustrations are beautiful and convincing; whilst its style is remarkable for its simplicity. Appended to these ten lectures are literary and theological notes covering 150 pages full of profound learning. The author is a Lutheran of the moderate Evangelical type, but just such a Lutheran as all Christians must honor and love. We cordially recommend the work to ministers and people.

"He only will be saved who unites himself to Christ, not with a view of offering again a sacrifice which was perfect in itself, but in order to make it his own by an earnest acceptance and a living faith. If the imputation of Christ's merits was all external, it would be found that He had obeyed in order to dispense us from obeying. If that had been His object, He need not have left heaven at all."

But let this suffice in the way of quotation. *The doctrine of justification by faith is that of the universal Evangelical Church of Christendom.*

Whilst penning these lines, the newspapers of New York and Philadelphia are sending forth over the length and breadth of the land the proceedings of the Evangelical Alliance* in the former city, where are assembled representative men, Christian ministers and laymen, from the various nations of Europe, and even from the far-off Orient, and every man of them who has spoken his sentiments,—the dignitary of the Church of England, the learned professor in the university, the nobleman, Reformed, Lutheran, Presbyterian, Episcopal, Independent, Methodist, all,—*all* as with one voice testify to this doctrine as a standing article of the Christian system. Constrained for months past by

* For a further notice of the Evangelical Alliance, see Appendix.

family affliction to spend his time in the narrower circle of his home, the writer has been quickened and refreshed in spirit whilst reading, day after day, the deep-toned and inspiriting utterances of these Christian men, commingling from all parts of the world, and touching thousands of other hearts all over Protestant Christendom.* Not one discordant utterance has been heard on this precious gospel truth. Let

---

* And yet, sad to say, one of our professors in the Lancaster Seminary is found making an attempt—feeble and futile, to be sure—to prejudice us against the (then prospective) meeting of that body, by raising objections against one of the topics in its programme, on the subject of "Prayer for the Outpouring of the Holy Spirit on Christians" throughout the world, and other objects. In several articles in the *Messenger* a long and labored effort was made to show that prayer for such blessings is wrong, and the sentiment *false*, because the Holy Spirit is always in Christ's mystical body, the Church; that the Holy Ghost always "abides and works in the hearts of those who are baptized into Christ." All that we wish to say to *this* new view is, that if it were true, we ought to have a large number of our hymns expunged from our Hymn-Books, or at least greatly changed,—hymns which have warmed the hearts of millions of God's people, such as, "Come, Holy Spirit, come," "O heil'ger Geist, kehr bei uns ein," Paul Gerhardt's "O Sacred Head now Wounded," and very many others. Even the new Liturgy would have to be toned down in some of its prayers in which there are expressions of what the professor calls a "Rationalistic decadence," and "error and unbelief" (!). It grieves us in our inmost soul, that one of our theological teachers, for whom we have ever entertained great respect, and who in former years held entirely different views, should be capable of uttering views which, according to our convictions, sound rationalizing,—yea, Rationalistic. We see plainly enough that the "new theology" has no room in its theory for the Holy Spirit in the accepted evangelical sense as held from the beginning. But this does not make it any better, but worse a great deal.

the question be asked and pondered, Are all these men wrong?

But it may be asked,—

DOES THE NEW OR MERCERSBURG THEORY TEACH A DIFFERENT VIEW?

We say decidedly, Yes, it does.

This follows already as a natural consequence from its incarnation theory as the central dogma in Christianity. As we have seen, its theory of redemption is radically different from that of the Reformed Church, in that it is said to consist in an organic conveyance or transmission "of the substance of the glorified humanity of Christ" to man. Hence, as this redemption is in reality of a physical nature, in some way,—physical in the sense that it is not ethical or spiritual,—so also the method or means of *applying* to man this redemption must be of the same nature. It is not a spiritual operation, not an influence exerted upon the soul by the Holy Spirit, but a transmission of a substance. It follows, hence, that *faith*, in the sense of the Catechism, is set aside, or so eviscerated that nothing but the shadow of it is left. According to the new theory of Mercersburg and Lancaster, faith is a sort of organ of the soul which lays hold of or apprehends the theanthropic life of Christ in a real, substantial way. It holds

also that there are certain channels or means (first of all Baptism) by which this peculiar life is transmitted. *Such* faith, however, is not the believing "with the heart unto righteousness," and so unto salvation; not that faith which the Apostle (Rom. v. 1–6) holds up in triumph, as that which justifies and blesses its possessor with such glorious prerogatives. It is not the faith of the Protestant Church, and most certainly not that of our Heidelberg Catechism.*

What the new theory calls faith is a faith in *the Church* and that which is comprehended in all that belongs to it. (Hence some of the friends and supporters of that theory frequently say that to believe in the Church and to believe in

---

* The editor of an Old-School German Lutheran paper ("*Gemeinde-Blatt*") in the West,—the same body, we believe, to which Professor Fritschel belongs, who found Dr. Nevin's view on the sacraments rather palatable, only that he went still further than these High Church Lutherans could go,—in noticing the last conversion of a Reformed minister to the Roman Church, says,—

"We have long been convinced that the views of Nevin in regard to the Church (*Kirchenthum Nevins*) is nothing else than a Romanizing tendency, and that one thing is wanted to make it soundly Lutheran, and that is exactly the principal thing, namely, *justification by faith alone.*" These High Church Lutherans cannot but be pleased with many things in the new theory of Mercersburg and Lancaster, and which these last eagerly lay as a flattering unction to themselves; but when it comes to the main thing, these Lutherans repudiate the new theory in the most decided way. And so long as they do this, so long as they hold fast by this Reformation truth, they are still soundly Protestant and evangelical, however they may out-Luther Luther in some other regards.

Christ is the same thing!) A faith *in* Christ, a justifying faith, in the language and the sense of the Catechism and the New Testament, is therefore ruled out by the new theory. In fact, it cannot be otherwise, if the previous positions of the incarnation theory and the Mercersburg notion of the Church are held. According to the new theory, the sinner is justified and saved in an entirely different way. We will allow Dr. Dorner to corroborate what is here said.* He refers in this extract to that part of Dr. Nevin's "Vindication" of the Liturgy in which he charges his opponents with denying the historical Christ of the incarnation, the onward flow of His (Christ's) life transmitting itself through Baptism and the Holy Supper, which he calls the spirit of Antichrist, and other very harsh epithets which we forbear to transcribe. Dr. Dorner says,—

"Underlying this entire statement, there is an *identification of the Church* in its actual, his-

---

* Dr. I. A. Dorner, one of the most eminent theologians in Germany, and a professor in the University of Berlin. Dr. Nevin had frequently appealed to him as holding similar views in regard to the person of Christ, etc. A few years ago Dorner felt constrained to publish a lengthy and exhaustive criticism on Dr. Nevin's theory as this is unfolded in the *Mercersburg Review*, the *Liturgy*, etc. This criticism, whilst breathing a kind and truly Christian spirit, is a decided protest against every fundamental position in the new theory. We shall have occasion to refer to some of these criticisms in the sequel.

torical manifestation *with Christ.* Only *he* believes in an objective and historical Christ (according to Nevin)* who sees in the Church not merely the witness of Christ, but the historically self-unfolding and developing Christ Himself; and only in this sense does there remain, in his view, any immediate relation between Christ and the believer. That the importance of Christ as the Mediator, in and of itself, is thus made to stand back of this Church, is especially seen in the fact that his theory dwells mostly on the mystical communication of the life of Christ, on the expansion of the theanthropic life, whilst it has little to say of justification, but rather allows this to be merged* in sanctification. For the Church can be thus identified with Christ only by ignoring the work of atonement and justification (which rests in the earthly and heavenly high-priesthood of Christ) in its important principial signification, and by laying the whole weight only upon the powers of sanctification which are unfolded in the Church, and which are mediated to believers through the Church and her organs, and only through them.† This will become still clearer by the following statement of Nevin: 'Where the gospel (he says) is not apprehended as the historical (in the Church), enduring, objective manifestation of God in the flesh, there can be no *steady apprehension* of

---

* *Verschwimmen lässt,* dissolved.

† On the importance of distinguishing justification from sanctification, see Appendix C.

that which constitutes the proper mystery of it in this view, namely, the union there is in it of the supernatural with the natural in an abiding, historical (not magical) form. This precisely is the true object of an evangelical faith in the New Testament sense, the objective power of salvation, through the apprehension of which only faith becomes justifying and saving'" (p. 78).

After reminding Dr. Nevin that his severe accusations against his opponents and other denominations for being extremely "subjective"* is uncalled for, seeing how firmly they cling to the grace of God in Christ, to the crucified Redeemer, and justification by faith alone (all of them clearly revealed, and therefore *objective* truths), he says:

"He himself moves in a subjectivism of his own which deceives itself with a delusive 'objectivism.' For where does he get his certainty of his idea of the Church, and where are the proofs for it? Arbitrarily and without proper judgment he takes for granted as true what the Church *before* the Reformation says of itself, whilst he still does not allow that the Papacy is a Divine institution; and yet by rejecting *it*, to be consistent, he ought to reject all that was the *germ* of it. It is easy to see how a person can by faith attain to a Divine and joyful assurance

* *Subjective*, internal view or feeling, and is opposed to *objective*, or views governed by that which is from without.

of his personal salvation, and hence also of Christ as his Redeemer, because the power of the gospel which he has received testifies of itself. But how faith is to attain to any certainty from that church-theory is difficult to see, unless it be arbitrarily, or by an arbitrary surrender to churchly authority."

Just so. The faith of the new theory is a faith in the so-called "objective" powers in the "Church." The faith of the gospel, the faith as explained in the Heidelberg Catechism, and of the whole evangelical Church, is something not so exclusively and entirely "objective," but also subjective, inward, personal, and experimental. It is "not only a certain *knowledge*, . . . but also an *assured confidence*, which the *Holy Ghost works by the gospel in my heart;* that not only to others, *but to me also*, remission of sin, everlasting righteousness, and salvation are freely given by God, merely of grace, only for the sake of Christ's merits."

This is where we as Protestants stand; this is where the Reformed Church and her symbol stand, and we trust in God will ever stand,—

"When rolling years shall cease to move."

And though an angel from heaven should preach to us another gospel than this, we cannot, we will not believe it, for there is not another (Gal. i. 7).

ARE MINISTERS OF THE GOSPEL PRIESTS?

This is a vital question. It is another dividing line between the Church of Rome and the Church of the Reformation, including not only the Reformed and Lutheran, but also the Church of England, and others. The word "priest" is supposed to be abbreviated from the word "presbyter," which means an *elder*. In the Episcopal Church the term *priest* is indeed used in her Prayer Book, but not (as will be shown hereafter) in the sense of the Jewish economy. The Roman Catholic Church alone employs the word in that sense, that is to say, in the sense of one who offers sacrifice. By no Protestant Church is the term used or recognized except when referring to the Lord Jesus Christ, who is the only true Priest, with His one altar and one sacrifice, "once for all" (time) made on the cross. Dr. Thomas Arnold, a clergyman of the English (Episcopal) Church, who died in 1842, gives the definition of the priest's office in these words: "The essential point in the notion of a *priest* is this: that he is a person necessary to our intercourse with God, without being necessary or beneficial to us morally."

It might be asked, however, whether it is not just as proper to have a priesthood, an altar, and sacrifices in the Church now as under the

Jewish economy. Why not call the ministry a priesthood, the Lord's supper a sacrifice, and the communion-table an altar?

To this it might be replied, in the language of the moderate and judicious Dr. Hoff, of the Episcopal Church, that "it ought to be reason enough for us that we know the inspired writers constantly avoid the use of such terms in this connection.* The words to express the Jewish minister and the Christian, and their acts, are always carefully distinguished."†

That the terms "priest" and "priesthood" were used at an early day in the Christian Church is very true. Christian converts from the Jewish Church were familiar with those terms, and would easily fall into the accustomed phraseology, even when not ascribing the original meaning to the terms. "The mistake was natural, but the effects were most mischievous." In the third and fourth centuries, and onward, the Judaizing or legalistic leaven was already at work, as the writings of that period clearly show. The truth is, the tendency of the human mind is, and always has been, to rest in some-

---

* "The Christian Ministry not a Priesthood." Baltimore, 1869.

† 1 Peter ii. 5, where Christians are called a priesthood, or a community of priests. Dr. Lange, in his commentary on the passage, says, "All believers of the New Testament are anointed priests by the *Holy Ghost*." Not a particular class of men, therefore.

thing done or offered by ourselves in order to merit salvation. Even in the apostolic period there was a tendency in this direction, especially on the part of Jewish converts,—a leaning to and hankering for outward observances, an exalting of the Jewish sacrifices and ceremonials to such an extent that "Christ the Crucified" was in a measure set aside as the "All and in All." Read Galatians, fifth and sixth chapters, where Paul calls it "falling from grace" if they regarded circumcision and other ceremonials and ritualistic observances as things necessary to salvation. And this strong language is used by the same Paul who, at an earlier period in his apostolate, allowed himself to bring offerings to the temple, and himself performed the rite of circumcision upon Timothy (Acts xvi. 3), by way of allaying weak consciences who had not yet been able to free themselves from what had once been a Divine ordinance, but which had no more binding force. (See Appendix F, for some remarks by Dr. Neander.)

In the lapse of time, Christian teachers departed from the Scriptural mode of speaking on this subject. "Christ and His divinely-appointed intervention for the reconciliation of man to God were more and more obscured by the obtrusive services of the earthly priesthood, until at last there was need of a special inter-

position from above to restore the doctrine." This interposition was the Reformation in the sixteenth century.

All the Reformers—German, Swiss, French, and English—were of one mind on this subject. There was not one dissenting voice among them. They all saw clearly that just this very doctrine of a mediating human priesthood was the foundation of all that is erroneous in the Roman Catholic system. That system was the slow growth of centuries. But the beginning of the system as it now stands, culminating in the infallibility of the Pope, rests in the doctrine that there is a priesthood; that there is a class of men who stand between sinful man and his God for the purpose of mediating the salvation of the gospel; that man can only through the priest (of course as the representative of *the Church*) have access to his Maker and obtain His favor.

Now, the Reformers had full knowledge of the results of centuries of slavish subjection to the priest, claiming to dispense mercy and grace by transmitted authority, to the neglect of God's written word.

Let us for a moment look at the religious sentiment which prevailed at the time of the Reformation, and which still prevails in the Roman Church. The "judicious Hooker," in

England, who was accused of being too moderate in his opposition to Romanism, says in his "Ecclesiastical Polity:"

"The Romanists imagine that when God remits the eternal punishment of sin He reserves torments to be endured for a time shorter or longer according to the quality of men's crimes. Yet there is a certain contract by virtue of which works assigned by the priest shall satisfy God touching that punishment. Yet, as they cannot assure any man that this will suffice, they hold that the soul must remain in unspeakable torture until all be paid. Therefore they advise men to secure prayers and sacrifices after they are gone [the mass]. Hence the infinite pensions of their priests, the building of so many altars and tombs, the enriching of churches, etc. But, this done, how far it will avail they are not sure. Hence they have invented the idea that Christ's merits (over and above what are necessary for the remission of the eternal penalty), and those of the saints through Him, are common stock, to which the Pope has the key. Christ remits not eternal death without the priest's absolution (unless in certain extreme cases), and the Pope, as it pleases him, delivers from the limited punishment which may remain."

Let the reader for a moment look at this corruption from which the Reformation freed the Church. Think of the contrast between such a doctrine and that of full and perfect forgive-

ness to every one who believes in Jesus! And this is what the gospel teaches.

But whilst Romanists demand such a high claim for priestly intervention, they sometimes relax this claim in a manner entirely inconsistent with themselves. Thus, some of their doctors teach that "whosoever turneth to God with his whole heart hath immediately his sins taken away." Now, if they are pardoned of God *before* they come to the priest, how then can they say that the priest remits anything? Yet when Protestants ascribe the work of remission to God, and interpret the priest's sentence to be but a solemn *declaration* of that which God Himself has already performed, they scorn at it. (*Hooker.*)

The Protestant Doctrine.

Now let us see what the Protestant Church, —especially the Reformed branch of it, in the narrow sense—teaches on this subject.

In the 31st Question of the Heidelberg Catechism, Christ is spoken of as "our *only High Priest*, who by the *one sacrifice of His body* has redeemed us," etc. Nowhere in that excellent and precious summary of Divine truth does the word "priest" or "priesthood" occur in connection with the Christian ministry, nor is there anything like an allusion to the powers and

functions of a priest, in the Romish sense, according to which the blessing of pardon is bound to the act of the priest. We may say clearly and emphatically, the New Testament Church, the Apostolic Church, and, in accordance with her, the Protestant Church, HAS NO PRIESTS AND NO PRIESTHOOD. What the Reformers contended for—every one of them—was the *universal priesthood of all Christians* as against the false assumptions of Romanism. Rome said, You can only approach to God through the priest, who is the Divine agent of the Church. No penitence, no faith, no prayers, can avail before God, until you come to the confessional, and from that medium, divinely appointed and authorized, receive not merely a declaration or announcement of pardon on the condition of repentance and faith, but that forgiveness is actually conveyed and received at the moment of pronouncing it. Hence, no matter how sincerely penitent an individual may be, his sins are not forgiven by God until the priest on earth has pronounced that forgiveness over him!

The evangelical Church holds to no such priestly mediating view as this. She has *ministers*, *preachers*, *bishops* (which means *shepherds*), *stewards*, *messengers*, but she has no *priests;* neither has the New Testament. God

has not bound the forgiveness of sins, or any other grace, to the official act of a man. The passages of Scripture which are adduced by the Church of Rome to prove the opposite are a monstrous as well as preposterous perversion of their meaning. They are Matt. xvi. 19 and Matt. xviii. 18. The first is the saying of Christ to Peter: "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." The other confers the same power, as the context shows, *upon all Christians.* It is not, therefore, a priestly power conferred upon a special class of men as ministers. This is usually called the "power of the keys;" and the Roman Church, and very High Church people elsewhere, wish to prove from these passages—what? That every preacher is not only a priest, but that he also stands on an equality with the Apostles, who were miraculously chosen, and endowed with extraordinary, miraculous gifts and powers of the Holy Ghost in the founding of the Christian Church. These miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit, says the able Church historian Dr. Ebrard, were necessary for the *founding* of the Church, but not necessary for its further continuance, such as the power of the keys, a

gift peculiar to the Apostles and their immediate assistants, exercised in prophetic illumination correlative with the *special* communication of the Spirit (John xx. 22), and, *therefore*, unconditionally valid and miraculous" (John xx. 23. Compare Acts v. 5 and 10; 1 Cor. v. 3, etc.). So, too, they had the extraordinary gift of "speaking with tongues," healing the sick, prophecy, and raising the dead. It is true, as Ebrard also says, that the Apostles did not exclusively possess these gifts, but they exclusively were able to *impart them to others* (Acts viii. 15, 16), and hence we read of those gifts as being in existence in the apostolic period, and in the period immediately following, but after that they cease. According to the second passage quoted (Matt. xviii. 18), it is to be observed that Christ accords the power of the keys to *all* of His disciples, and with them to the Church generally, "or rather," says Dr. Lange, "to the Church along with the disciples." For in verse 17 He lays down the rule for the conduct of the Church, and verse 18 shows that the Church is warranted in this conduct.

Now let us see what our Catechism teaches on this subject. Does it teach that the minister has priestly powers lodged in him by virtue of his office, to bind or loose, to open or shut the kingdom of heaven?

"*Quest.* 83. What are the keys of the kingdom of heaven?

"*Ans.* The preaching of the Holy Gospel and Christian discipline, or the excommunication out of the Christian Church; by these two the kingdom of heaven is opened to believers and shut against unbelievers.

"*Quest.* 84. How is the kingdom of heaven opened and shut by the preaching of the Holy Gospel?

"*Ans.* Thus: when, according to the command of Christ, it is declared and *publicly testified to all and every believer*, that *whenever they receive the promise of the gospel by a true faith, all their sins are really forgiven them of God, for the sake of Christ's merits;* and, on the contrary, when it is declared and testified to all unbelievers, and such as do not sincerely repent, that they stand exposed to the wrath of God and eternal condemnation, so long as they are unconverted; according to which testimony of the gospel God will judge them, both in this and the life to come."

And then in the 85th Answer it is explained *how* the kingdom of heaven is shut and opened by Christian discipline, declaring that those who walk disorderly, and who return not to duty after being admonished by the Church, shall be forbidden the use of the sacraments, "whereby they are excluded from the Christian Church, and by God Himself from the kingdom of Christ."

No allusion here, nothing that looks like "priestly powers," by virtue of which sins are remitted or retained by the priest. The "preaching of the gospel," and the exercise of "Christian discipline," which last is to be exercised by the *Church*, or those "who are thereunto appointed by the Church."

Dr. F. W. Krummacher, who is acknowledged as good Reformed authority, and whom our Church unanimously called to fill a theological professorship in 1843, but which he declined, says, in his *Sabbath Glocke* (Sabbath Chimes), on John xx. 22, 23:

"God has not given the power of the forgiveness of sin out of His own hand, but has retained its absolution to *Himself*. But I hear some one object by saying, 'But does it not say here, Whosesoever sins ye remit?' All very true. But in the sense of: In the *name* and by the *authority* of God, after that the Holy Spirit has testified that this or that person who seeks the forgiveness of his sins is in such a state of mind, upon whom God, according to His word, will seal forgiveness unto him. To a spiritually dead preacher God gives no such prerogative. A stranger to his own heart, he is totally disqualified to judge the innermost state of others. What would it amount to, though he should say ten or a hundred times, Thy sins are remitted or not remitted? His words would drive to the four winds of heaven without meaning and

without effect, because it is without the higher sanction. In the kingdom of Christ, which is a kingdom of the Holy Ghost, things do not proceed in this mechanical style, but all His operations proceed through well-chosen organs. The naked office in such case is *not* the channel of Divine powers. It is through *sanctified* personalities that the water of life flows. Just suppose, on the one hand, an unenlightened, unholy, and God-forsaken bishop, and on the other hand a private Christian or layman like the godly Tersteegen, or Jung-Stilling, or Baron von Kottwitz,*—to whom among these would you believe yourselves directed by God if you felt the need of some human counsel or instruction, when seeking the consolations of the grace of God for your souls? You would not require time for consideration, but as with one voice you would say most decidedly, that the Ananias that you would seek should be one of the three last-named persons. I should do the same, and would allow the first-named, notwithstanding his high-sounding title and official dignity, to stand aside. For it remains forever true that the authority to forgive and retain sin is not an exclusive authority which is *bound to the office*, but is an authority of the Spirit, which is not a prerogative only of the ministerial vocation, but to those of the *universal priesthood of believers*. That pastor who is born of God possesses it, and will exercise it in his churchly forms. But no less he, though he may be among the lowly

* Well-known and devout laymen and authors in Germany.—S.

members of the congregation, if there has been given him the gift of 'discerning the spirits,' and he exercises that gift in his humble way with equal authority and with equal effect."*

As this is a vital question to us as Protestants, inasmuch as the whole Romish system is founded upon their sacerdotal priesthood, culminating in the powers of the Pope, and latterly of Papal Infallibility, which last is but the pinnacle to the whole structure, let us consult a few more authorities,—authorities not merely of representative men, but official Reformed Church authorities, to which, as ministers and members, we are obliged to pay deference.

The Second Helvetic (Swiss) Confession stands among the very first of the standards of the Reformed Church, and alongside of the Heidelberg Catechism itself. The great and good Bullinger drew it up. It has the signa-

* It should perhaps be remarked that Krummacher guards himself well in all he says, and hence we read in preceding paragraphs: "The Evangelical ministry is an ordinance of God, which has great promises. But the *office* does not impart to him who is clothed with it a *mediating function* in any sense between Christ and the Church. . . . In the next place, the office, which *seeks* the man but does not *make* him, imparts to its bearer none of those independent Divine powers apart from his personal spiritual state so far as regards the qualification to minister in the things of the Spirit effectively. By this it is not denied that in the Church certain churchly offices may be firmly bound to the office, and that the Sacraments, for instance, as well as lesser services, still remain what they are, even though an unworthy minister should administer them."

tures of approbation by delegates from the Churches of England, Germany, Switzerland, Scotland, France, Holland, Poland, and Hungary. Its date is 1566, three years after the Heidelberg Catechism was published. The pious Elector Frederick the Third specially requested Bullinger to publish this Confession of Faith, so well was he pleased with it, and gave as a reason for the request, that it would go to prove that it was in accord with the Heidelberg Catechism, and hence would show the agreement which existed in different countries in regard to Reformed doctrines.

Now, what does it teach on the *Universal Priesthood of Believers?*

"All (Christians) are indeed by the Apostle called priests (ye are kings and priests unto God), but not in respect to their office, but because all believers through Christ can, as kings and priests, bring spiritual sacrifices to God." Again: "The priesthood and ministry are very different from each other. The former (the priesthood) is common to all Christians, as already said: the latter is not so. . . . For the new covenant there is no more, as in the old, a priesthood which has an external anointing, holy vestments, and manifold ceremonies, which were once types of Christ. *All these things hath He abolished by His coming*, the types being fulfilled. He alone remains Priest to all eternity; and in order that we may not detract

from Him anything, we do not give the name priest to any minister in the Church."

"Of the Confession of Sin. We heartily approve of the general open confession of sin in the Church; . . . for it agrees with Scripture.

"Of the Power and Duty of the Ministry. Concerning their power, some have very zealously contended and wished to subordinate everything on earth to their control; yet contrary to the command of the Lord, who forbids all lordship to His followers, and rather commands humility.

"Of the Office of the Keys. Concerning the keys of the kingdom of heaven, which by the Lord were committed to the Apostles, astonishing things have been spoken, and out of them have been forged swords, lances, sceptres, and crowns; and full power over the greatest empires, yea, even over souls and bodies, has been drawn from it. . . . All properly-called preachers have and exercise the keys of the kingdom of heaven *when they proclaim the gospel*, namely, when they teach, exhort, comfort, admonish, and keep in discipline the people entrusted to their fidelity. . . . They therefore use these keys when they preach repentance and faith. Thus do they reconcile us to God. *Thus do they remit sin*, and thus unlock the kingdom of heaven and lead believers into it."

This language speaks for itself. No priesthood in the Romish sense; no private confessional; no priestly absolution; but, on the con-

trary, a most decided protest against any and every thing of the sort.

Luther's View. Let us now give attention to only a few out of numerous expressions from this genial, outspoken German Reformer:

"Those who preside over the people in the Word and Sacraments may and shall not be called priests. That they are so called, however, is either done in heathen fashion, or is a remnant of the Jews' laws, and afterwards was accepted with great damage to the Church. But according to the evangelical Scriptures they had better be called ministers (servants), deacons, bishops, stewards, or presbyters."

Dr. Nitzsch, the Patriarch of Evangelical Protestantism in Germany, as he has been called, in his reply to the able but sophistical Roman Catholic, *Moehler*, after stating that Christ gave gifts to Apostles, Evangelists, Prophets, etc., in the founding of His Church, adds:

"But that in or by the side of them he placed *priests*, we do not find."

He then proceeds to explain the heaven-wide difference between the *ministry* in the gospel sense and the *priesthood* in the Romish sense, and says that the Apostle Peter saw the priesthood (in the New Testament sense) *in the congregation*, in the *believers*, as such, and then

quotes with approbation the declaration of another, "that in the New Testament there is no priesthood of this sort" (in the sacerdotal or Roman Catholic sense).

Dr. Ebrard, an eminent living theologian also, and Reformed, the author of numerous works, has in certain quarters been quoted as favoring certain views which (he says) he does not hold. Here is what he says on the subject before us:

"The minister is only one of the congregation, himself a sinner, who needs forgiveness and sanctification, and this in itself cuts off a particular priesthood. For the sake of order, and by Christ's appointment, there is an office of the ministry, but no *priesthood*. . . . When the minister leads in prayer, he does not pray as a priest *for* the congregation, *but as a pastor with them*."

And thus we might go on quoting page after page from scores of Reformed, Lutheran, and Evangelical (the United) Church of Germany, France, Holland, and Switzerland,—from Palmer, Tholuck, Julius Müller, Schröder, Von Hoffmann, the Gerlachs, and their like. But it is needless. The voice of the Protestant Church for three hundred and fifty years is unanimous on this point. It has ever been held that just this subject of the priesthood

was the starting-point of the gradual divergence from the simplicity of the gospel of Christ, carrying with it the manifold human devices and producing the fearful corruptions of the Roman Church. This has ever been admitted by some theologians of the milder or more moderate type in this Church, such as Bishop Sailer and others.

WHAT DOES THE MERCERSBURG-LANCASTER THEOLOGY TEACH?

Having thus shown what the Roman Catholics teach in regard to the priesthood, and then proved from the Catechism, and similar Reformed Confessions, and the best representative men of the evangelical Church, that the Protestant Church from the start held an entirely different view, grounded upon the unadulterated word of God, we shall now attempt to show—

That the new theory taught at Mercersburg and Lancaster differs widely and essentially from the Reformed doctrine, and from the doctrine of the general Protestant Church.

It is not in a spirit of self-sufficiency, much less with a desire to find fault needlessly, that this task is undertaken. Would to God there were no cause for such unwelcome task!

Firmly and conscientiously believing that there is such cause, we venture to perform the task, in this as in the preceding points.

We say, then, that the new theory has taught and is teaching in the *Mercersburg Review*, in the *Order of Worship* (the Liturgy), in the *Messenger*, as well as in other ways, views on the *priesthood* which are greatly at variance with the universal doctrines of evangelical Protestantism, and therefore at variance also with the standards and faith of the Reformed Church. These new teachings coincide with a small fraction of ultra-Lutherans in Germany, and with the Puseyite or High Church party in the English (Episcopal) Church, whose views, again, trench so closely on Roman Catholic ground that the division-line is hardly perceptible.

Let us then specify more particularly, by way of answering the question, What does Mercersburg-Lancaster teach on the subject in hand?

We reply, it teaches that—

"The Church is the actual body of Christ, and those who do not realize that, as His body, it possesses all the authority which of right belongs to Him, of course do not realize their duty to be obedient unto the Church as unto Christ. They are unable to comprehend that in the Church are now lodged the prerogative of teaching, the priestly functions of the Saviour,

and also His kingly functions, and must continue there in virtue of His appointment."

This extract is from the Report on the State of Religion adopted by the Synod in Danville, held in 1869. It was drawn up by its chairman, the Rev. Geo. D. Wolff, who has since become a convert to Rome. The Synod, by the adoption of that report, made it its own in an official way. We will yet remark that the foregoing extract is introduced in these words:

"The spirit of infidelity afflicts many members of our Church, and thus weakens and hinders her. . . . This spirit of unbelief is associated with a spirit of insubordination."

And then, after the extract before given, the following harsh words follow:

"Hence these deluded though often sincere persons imagine that they are right in making their own judgments a law to themselves; and they frequently rebel against the authority of those who, by Divine, not human appointment, have the rule over them, not understanding that in so doing they are resisting lawful authority, rending the 'body of Christ,' breaking the unity of the Spirit, and following him who is the Antichrist, 'the father of lies.'"

Let any one now compare these extracts in regard to "priestly functions" and what is falsely called "Scriptural truth" in reference to the

Church possessing all the authority which belongs to Christ, and then say if such a view of the priesthood and Church authority is a whit behind that of the Roman Church. And then, too, the arrogant and denunciatory way in which all this is spoken savors of the very essence of a Pope's fulmination. Those who hold, as we have seen, to the Reformed view, to Protestant doctrine, to gospel teaching, are charged with the "spirit of infidelity," are said to be "deluded," make their own judgments a law to themselves, rebel against lawful authority because they obey not the authority of what is called Divine appointment, designate the Church as represented by the Synod the "actual body of Christ," and charge those who do not believe this with breaking the unity of the Spirit and "following him who is the Antichrist, the father of lies!" Verily, Dr. Dorner is right when he says in his criticism of the new theory, of which the foregoing is an advanced specimen, that such arbitrary heaping of all Church powers upon the ministerial office, and thus robbing the laity of their proper rights, "*sets every minister higher than the Church of Rome sets her bishops.*" In an article from the pen of Dr. Gerhart in the *Mercersburg Review* for October, 1867, he says of the prevailing evangelical system,—

"This system admits that the minister is a

teacher of Divine truth, and in some sense a ruler, but denies that he is a priest, nor does he perform any functions which are Divine acts. The success of his labors depends entirely upon the degree of his faith and piety, his talents and scholarship, his eloquence and tact, and upon the measure of heavenly blessings with which God may favor his preaching of the gospel, but not on the Divine powers of his office, nor on his authority to administer the sacraments and to remit or retain sin in the sense of Christ's words (John xx. 23)." [Appendix D.]

In the same way Dr. Nevin, in his pamphlet on the liturgical question, defends the unusual and un-Reformed language in the ordination service in the Liturgy, where the office is invested with the character of a *sacrament* "flowing directly from the Lord Jesus Christ Himself as the fruit of His resurrection and triumphant ascension into heaven, and being designed by Him to carry forward *the purpose of His grace on earth in the salvation of men by the Church* to the end of time." In the ordination service we read,—

"The first ministers were apostles who were called and commissioned immediately by Christ Himself. They, in turn, ordained . . . other suitable men as pastors, . . . and these again in the same way appointed others to carry onward and forward still the true succession of this office; which, being regularly transmitted in

this way from age to age in the Christian Church, has come down finally to our time. The solemnity of ordination, through which this transmission flows, is not merely an impressive ceremony, . . . but it is to be considered rather as their *actual investiture with the very power of the office itself, the sacramental seal of their heavenly commission*, and a symbolical assurance from on high that their consecration to the service of Christ is accepted, and that the Holy Ghost will most certainly be with them in the faithful discharge of their official labors. They are appointed to . . . *offer up* before Him the prayers of His people. . . . They are also charged with *the government of the Church*, and with the proper use of its discipline in the way of *censure and absolution* according to that awfully mysterious word in Matt. xvi. 18." [Nothing is said of elders, only they, the ministers.]

In the same service the minister before ordination is asked,—

"Are you truly persuaded in your heart that you are called of God to the office of the holy ministry, and do you desire and expect to receive, *through the laying on of our hands, the gifts and grace of the Holy Ghost*, which shall enable you to fulfill this heavenly commission and trust?"

This is sufficiently plain, surely. "Through the laying on of our hands the gifts and grace of the Holy Ghost" are received by him who is to

be ordained. We have, we think, in preceding pages given the proof that the evangelical Protestant Church knows nothing and will know nothing of such mechanism. And as for the ordinary gifts and grac*es* of the Holy Spirit, we hold again, with the Protestant Church, that if the person to be ordained does not possess these *before* he is ordained he will not possess them afterwards. Ordination is not a channel for the giving or imparting of supernatural and magical powers, but a *confirmation* (Bestätigung) of the call to the ministerial office. All the Reformed Confessions which touch upon the subject teach nothing else. The words of the first *Helvetic Confession*, as it is the briefest, may stand here as an example. After stating that this office should not be intrusted to any that are not found by the proper authorities to be well acquainted with the word of God and to be of a pure life and full of zeal for the cause and honor of Christ, it adds,—

"Since this is a real DIVINE CALL, it is of right confirmed by the Church (*Gemeine*), by the laying on of hands of a minister."

To say that this view of the ministerial office would bring the Church down to the level of a "temperance society" is a monstrous perversion, and only confirms the language of the learned

Dr. Dorner, that "unless we are willing to adopt Romish tenets we must be content to hold that the organic communion which flows from Christ cannot be dependent upon the outward rite of a sacramental ordination, and does not first receive from *that* its reality and historical character."

"It will hardly be denied," says the same Dr. Dorner, "that these tenets on ordination go far beyond the bounds of those which are evangelical, and must lead to the Hierarchical" (the High Church or else the Romish system).

This theory of the special priesthood, in the nature of the case, affects more or less every theological point brought out in the Liturgy; and it was intended to do so.

Take the form of CONFIRMATION, for instance. Although it is well known that confirmation was not in use for a long time after the Reformation, neither by Luther, Zwingle, Calvin, nor their successors, yet it has for at least two centuries been found a wise and wholesome method, when properly guarded, of receiving persons into full communion with the Church. But the form of confirmation in the new Liturgy foists into that service an entirely new view. It describes it as the *completion of baptism* (pp. 203 and 206), "just as the Romish Church does," says Dorner, "at the expense of baptism, as if the

Apostles had 'confirmed by laying on of hands' all the adults whom they baptized." (See Appendix E.)

CONFESSION AND ABSOLUTION.

The peculiar *priestly theory* comes, as a matter of course, into view on confession and absolution. The wording of it (p. 10) might be allowed to stand, but, taking it in connection with the theory of the priesthood as held and as it must be held to rule here with the new theory, it follows that the remission of sin is bound to the formal pronouncement of it by the priest. When Dr. Dorner referred to this point by saying that forgiveness of sin in the view of Dr. Nevin was "bound to the outward organization and forms of the Church," and that therefore "this cardinal point cuts off individual Christians from direct communication with God by introducing a new priesthood," Dr. Nevin, in a harsh and—we cannot help saying—most sophistical way, defends the position, and charges those who hold a different view with regarding the Church as nothing more nor higher than a "civil corporation." But this is not correct. The charge is aimed at an imaginary opponent, in the Reformed Church at least, and in fact in all evangelical Churches. How is it, we may ask? do ministers of the Reformed, the Presbyterian,

the Lutheran, the Episcopal denominations—do Dr. Dorner, Prof. J. H. Klein, Dr. Hodge, Dr. W. A. Muhlenberg, Dr. Sprecher—"blaspheme the gospel," and are they "infidels," as it is said those are who do not hold these high-priestly views in regard to the functions of the Church and her ministers? And because they do not believe this, must they therefore be read out of the pale of Christ's Church and handed over to Satan? Because they believe, with evangelical Christendom, that the theory of a specific priesthood is a falsehood, do they therefore deserve the charge of believing the Church to be nothing higher than an Odd-Fellows' lodge or a temperance society, as our ears are accustomed to hear from every zealous advocate of the new theory until the people tire of the threadbare formulary?

Dr. Nevin asks (Vindic., p. 83), when the minister says that by the authority and in the name of Christ "your sins are forgiven you," whether this implies "that the minister himself pretends to forgive sins;" and then calls this "spiritualistic prudery of the most captious sort."

But we are not aware that such a charge has ever been made in this form. The Romish priest, nay, the immaculate and infallible Pope of Rome himself, does not pretend to forgive sin by his OWN authority. But the charge is

this, that by virtue of the Divine powers vested in and conferred upon the minister (priest), it is claimed that there can *be no assurance of the pardon of sin, unless it is declared and pronounced by a minister* (*priest*). That is the point. And we say that is just what the evangelical Church of all times and in all countries has denied, and on account of which thousands have been put to the rack, into prisons, and to the stake. (See Appendix F.)

To show still more clearly the direct, unmistakable teachings of the new-theory brethren on this subject, read the following:

"A sinner may be penitent for his sins, but until he has received baptism, as God's act of remission to him, he has no true assurance of remission; and when, after baptism, he sins through infirmity, he cannot be sure of pardon till his absolution is spoken, signed, and sealed by Christ, by means of a Divine act, through the Church." (*Mercersburg Review*, 1868, p. 31.)

And the following in the *Messenger*, by one of the regular official contributors to that paper, acknowledged to be Dr. D. Gans (May 15, 1872):

"That the power to absolve from sin was given to the Apostles, there are few who will call in question. . . . It was a great power, but it rested on a great gift, even the sovereign and infallible guidance of the Holy Ghost.

"As forming a part of the gospel of our Lord, this power necessarily descends in the Church from age to age. [This is assertion, but not proof.] . . . . Every true minister now . . . must possess the same authority. . . . How does this differ from the office of absolution . . . ? In the way of principle there is no difference.

"Why should any hesitate to believe all this, if one can steadily acknowledge the fact that the Holy Spirit is abidingly in the Church? Surely He is as competent now to qualify His ministers for the proper discharge of this duty as He was when first given."

OF PURGATORY.

It would not be fair to charge the believers of the new theory that they hold to or teach purgatory; and yet from the way in which some of them speak and write on the subject it is easy to see that there is some uncertainty in their minds about the subject. Thus, we read in the *Mercersburg Review*, vol. iv. p. 204:

"It is perfectly plain that the article of purgatory, so far as the primary conception of it is concerned, was in full vogue in the days of Augustine and Chrysostom; and that the faith of that period was accordingly in full contradiction here, as well as at other points not a few, to the whole system of modern Protestantism, whether Anglican or Puritan."

That is all so; but does this not rather go to show how deep the corruption in that period already was, and how unsafe it is, therefore, to refer so confidently to the "fathers" on all points? And when we know from some funeral addresses, as we do know, how darkly, shadowy, and murkily some of our brethren represent the state even of the "pious dead," it is enough to cast a gloom over the mind, and to cause us to ask, Are the blessed ones, then, doomed to wander up and down for ages in this gloomy future? No; purgatory is not taught, at least has not been; but such a passage as the foregoing has some significance.

Another uncertain sound. In vol. iii. p. 394 it is said,—

"To some it may seem, possibly, that putting the matter in this form is equivalent to a full surrender of the Church question in favor of Rome. If it were so, we ought not to shrink, certainly, from the confession of clear and open truth, just for the sake of avoiding that consequence."

Suppose I should say, Putting the matter thus and so might seem to imply that I am ready to surrender the question in favor of *Mormonism;* and I should then ward off the opponent by saying, Well, if it does lead you to embrace that system, you ought not to shrink

from the confession of clear and open truth, no matter about the consequence.

Certainly not, if it is *the truth*, God's revealed truth. But the very fact that I can speak in this hypothetical way is proof clear as sunlight, either that objective truth is not yet clearly seen and apprehended by myself, or (what is still worse) that I am insinuating my own notions into the mind of another for the purpose of driving out of his mind his belief,—a belief which to him is perhaps his joy and bliss,—and yet I give him no assurance of anything that is better, nay, only leave him in doubt. Is this not cruel?

So, too, Calvin (of whom even Lutheran theologians of Germany speak with the highest veneration), Zwingle, and other worthies of the Reformation period, are frequently spoken of in terms of reproach for holding certain doctrinal positions which do not square with the "subjectivism" of the men of the new theory, whilst a Moehler and other Romish authors are lauded in terms that cannot fail to tell us, *These are the men for us!*

Dr. Nevin speaks of Moehler thus: "One man like the learned and pious Moehler, now with God, who knows how to admit the historical significance of the Reformation," etc., and then passes on to a wholesale detraction of

Protestant defenders. We have nothing to say against that artful Roman champion; but when we see such a one thus carefully lauded, whilst Calvin and other greater and better men are treated with sneers, as some of the younger class of the theorists are doing, we cannot fail to see that "straws show which way the wind blows." And when we hear some of these same brethren say that they called to see the Romish bishop ——, of ——, whose company they enjoyed so very much, whilst they fail to pay even their compliments to brethren of their own communion in the same place, especially if they are known to hold the "old views," are these not signs of some significance?

ALTAR AND SACRIFICE.

Where there is a priest and a priesthood in the sense of the Roman Catholic Church, there must, as a necessary consequence, be an altar and victim, or a sacrifice. These are inseparable. They are joined together and cannot be sundered. Take one of these away, no matter which, and you take all three away. If the Christian Church has priests in the sacerdotal sense, then she must have a victim, something to be offered as a sacrifice in that sense. And if she has such a sacrifice, as the Romish Church has in the mass, then she must have an altar in that sense.

But we have shown, we think, by irrefragable evidence that the Reformed Church, yea, the evangelical Protestant Church at large, acknowledges no such priesthood. Christ is her only Priest, and, at the same time, her only Sacrifice. And hence she also acknowledges no altar in any priestly or sacerdotal sense. The Romish Church is consistent in having all three, because she holds to the mass, the so-called "unbloody sacrifice," in her service. It is with her the "holy of holies," the innermost sanctuary, and in her altars are deposited her sacred vessels, etc., as emblematic of this. Hence, when the priest engages in the services of the mass and in certain prayers, he turns his back to the people, thus facing the altar, which is for him the inner sanctuary, and makes adoration to it by bowing and crossing himself when approaching or passing it. The altar was generally elevated from the ground-floor; hence the name *alta ara*, "an elevated place."

In this sacerdotal sense, as applied to the new or Christian dispensation, the name never occurs. It is used only figuratively, spiritually, or by way of accommodation. Altars were usually built of stone. That of the Jewish Tabernacle was called the "brazen altar," and it, as well as the other vessels, seems to have been made chiefly of metal. Everything about

it, as indeed all the Old Testament ceremonial worship, was a type and symbol of the future New Testament sacrifice, of which it was a significant prefiguration. Thus, the daily offerings of animal sacrifices on the altar, the smoke of the burning flesh, the dark cloud mounting up toward heaven, were, as Dr. J. W. Nevin says in his *Biblical Antiquities*,—

"A continual remembrance of SIN, displaying in lively representation its awful guilt and the consuming wrath of heaven which it deserves. . . . 'This Brazen Altar,' to use the words of a learned and holy man, 'was a type of Christ dying to make atonement for our sins.' The *wood* (the inside lining) would have been consumed by the fire from heaven, if it had not been secured by the *brass;* nor could the *human nature* of Christ have borne the wrath of God if it had not been supported by a *Divine power*. Christ sanctified Himself for His Church as their Altar (John xvii. 19), and by His mediation sanctifies the daily services of His people, who also have a right to 'eat at this Altar' (Heb. xiii. 10), for they serve at it as spiritual priests. To the horns of this Altar (Lev. iv. 30, xvi. 18) poor sinners fly for refuge when justice pursues them, and there they are safe in the virtue of the sacrifice there offered. . . . *The washing of the body*, in the outward service of the ancient sanctuary, was intended to teach the necessity of inward purity in all who would draw near to Him in spirit and in truth (Psalm

xxvi. 6, lxvi. 18). Thus the Apostle exhorts believers to draw near to God with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having 'their hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and their bodies washed with pure water' (Heb. x. 22). So we need to be washed every day, and are required every day to come with repentance and faith to Christ, that we may be cleansed, and so fitted to come before the Lord with an acceptable service (James iv. 8; 1 John i. 7–10). More especially the laver, moreover, was a continual sign that the nature of man had become polluted, and that until the pollution was entirely taken away it could find no entrance into heaven. As on the altar the eye of faith might behold, as it were, this inscription, *Without shedding of blood there is no remission*, so also it might read upon the laver, *Without holiness no man shall see the Lord.* It is not enough that sacrifice and atonement are made for sin so as to satisfy the law; the soul needs at the same time to be delivered from its deep-rooted power, to be washed from its dark-colored stain, to be sanctified as well as justified, and so made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light. A laver, therefore, as well as an altar, was planted out before the tabernacle, and it stood *between* the altar and the sanctuary, showing that pardon through the Great Sacrifice is the first benefit which the believer receives, and that this is followed by the complete sanctification of his nature before he passes into the house not made with hands on high. . . . It gave assurance at the same time that this great

purification was not an object of despair, as it must have been if left to man to accomplish by his own power, but that the grace of God had made provision for it altogether sufficient and sure, that a *fountain for the uncleanness of sin* was wonderfully secured by the same love that procured *redemption from its guilt*, in which the soul might be made as white as if it had never been defiled with the smallest stain (Eph. v. 26, 27; Rev. i. 5, vii. 14)."—*Biblical Antiquities*, pp. 264–66.

We have purposely given the foregoing quotations at length, because they show us in the clearest light and in very apt language the purport and deeply-spiritual meaning of the symbolical and figurative terms which are employed in the Old Testament service. The whole of it is a grand, deeply-instructive ceremonial, "a shadow of good things to come," but which, having their fulfillment in Christ, "are passed away." *Christ*, therefore, is now the true, the only altar to the Christian; the "brazen altar" is needed no more to point to Him. He is here Himself. No external altar at Jerusalem or on Gerizim is now needed for the worshiper to approach unto,—so taught the Saviour Himself,—for they that worship Him worship Him in spirit and in truth. The Christian's altar, according to the passage quoted by Dr. Nevin in the passage above (Heb. xiii. 10),

is Christ Himself, whereof they have not the privilege to eat who serve in the tabernacle.

This might be sufficient to satisfy us that the term *altar* is now an inappropriate term in connection with New Testament worship. In any proper, in the Christian or *New Testament* sense, *there* IS NO ALTAR save as applied to the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. The exposition of Dr. Nevin, given in the foregoing quotations, is the undoubted true gospel sense, the sense of the early Church, the sense of the evangelical Church of Protestantism. The name *altar* was, it is true, retained by Luther, but without the Jewish or Roman Catholic idea connected with it. And as Protestants worshiped in a number of churches in Europe which were built in the middle ages with the regular altar-form in them, they continued to call it so, and also called the Lord's Supper the *sacrament of the altar*. But it was a misnomer. Luther repudiated, as we have seen, the *priesthood* in the Jewish and Romish sense with all his soul, and so also the term *altar* in its priestly and sacerdotal sense. The "sacrament of the altar," in proper language, means a priestly sacrifice in the Jewish or Roman Catholic sense, and nothing else. The Reformed Church, from the start, more free and unfettered than the Lutheran, refused to allow the term *altar* to be used, on account,

in a great measure, of the shameful abuses connected with it. And hence they at once restored the apostolical terms, "The Table of the Lord," "The Lord's Table," "The Supper of the Lord," etc. And it is very significant that in no one of the numerous confessional writings is this term ever used. It was designedly discarded.

THE REFORMED VIEW.

The Heidelberg Catechism does not contain the word *altar*, in the sense referred to, from beginning to end. In treating of the Eucharist it calls it the "Lord's Supper," the "Bread and Cup of the Lord," but nowhere does it speak of it as the "altar." There is a wise and Scriptural avoidance of any expression which by possibility could lead to the idea underlying that term.

Out of a number of Reformed Confessions, we shall quote only the following, to show why altars were discarded in the Reformed Churches:

Confession of Nassau (A.D. 1559): "And as we, as Christians, have, properly speaking, in the New Testament *neither altar nor sacrifice* as under the law of Moses; and the Papists have again introduced the altars from the old Levitical Priesthood, and only for this reason, because out of the Lord's Supper they have made the sacrifice of the mass. . . Therefore such entirely *idolatrous* altars have been *removed*, and in their stead proper tables, covered with cloth, are

placed in the churches and used for the communion. In some places the altars of stone have been remodeled so as to be like tables."

And again:

"It is certain from the history of the Church that altars were introduced long after the time of Constantine [in the fourth century]. From this it follows that the Church of God, from the Apostles' time down to the time of Constantine, made no use of altars in the administration of the Holy Sacraments, but only of tables. So also Christ in the first institution of the Supper. Hence the Apostle speaks, not of the altar, but of the Lord's Table."

Bremen Confession: "In the first and oldest churches there were for hundreds of years no altars in use, because the Old Covenant had ceased, and altars do not belong to the public worship of the New Covenant, after the fulfillment of the sacrifice of Christ, made through His death upon the cross. But when, under the Papacy, they made out of the Supper a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead, then they also introduced in a perverting manner the altar into the churches. And as in the mass they invoked the departed saints, so they also filled the altars with many sacred things and idolatrous pictures. They also held that the Supper could not be rightly administered, unless from a consecrated altar. And hence the *name has remained*, although it would be much more appropriate to call it, with the Apostle, *the Table of the Lord*. . . . Many of the Evangelical Churches, for the purpose of mani-

festing their earnest dislike of the papistic abominations connected with the sacrifice of the mass and invocation of saints, have entirely *abolished the altars*, and instead thereof make use of suitable tables, covered with a cloth, which are allowed constantly to remain in one place, from which the Supper is distributed. But if the fabulous holy things and idolatrous pictures have been removed, and the abomination of the mass has given place to the true doctrine and appropriate use of the Holy Supper, we allow it, from want of a better opportunity, to be a part of Christian liberty that, after doing away with the idolatrous practices, use be made of the masonry of the altars in the churches, as of a table of stone; and we regard it as useful for the edifying of God's Church, that in place of the wings which formerly were at the altar, hereafter the principal part of the Catechism be engraved in good readable letters and placed before their eyes; but, whether it be a table of stone or wood from which the Holy Sacrament be dispensed, it is always proper that the minister should turn, *not his back, but always his face toward the people*,* in order that the whole

* It is significant and worthy of note that some of the more ardent friends of the Mercersburg theology have already begun to imitate the custom here condemned, by turning their back to the people in performing certain portions of the liturgical service. The writer was witness himself of such a performance in a Reformed congregation, when two of our professors stood, one on the right, the other on the left side of the communion *table*, engaged in liturgical services preparatory to the communion on the following day. They faced *each other* (the table between them), having their backs to a *portion* of the

congregation may be able the better to hear, see, and understand that the reciting of the words of the institution of the Supper takes place, not on account of the bread and wine, but on account of the people, as also Christ Himself did not talk with the bread and wine, but with His disciples, in the institution of the Supper." (A.D. 1595.)

Even Luther himself, with all his conservatism in these outward matters, says that the "vestments (*Messgewänder*), altars, and candles might be allowed to remain as yet, until they are all to be changed, or until we think it is the right time. But in the right mass [he means the Supper], with true Christians, the altar would have to be changed, and the priest [minister] *always to turn toward the people*, as Christ Himself doubtless did in the Supper."

That eminent theologian and writer on Church History, Professor K. R. Hagenbach, of Basle, says:

"The elements (bread and wine) are placed upon the Table of the Lord, and are thence distributed to the people. This table is, in the Catholic and the Lutheran Church, the altar.

congregation,—a sort of compromise measure, we suppose, at least for the present. We repeat, such things are of themselves of no great moment, but as part and parcel of something back of them they are significant. On leaving the church referred to, a good, simple-hearted member of the congregation said to her companion, "Why did those two ministers stand *sideways* as they did?"—a question which the other could not answer.

The altar is also, in part, found in Reformed Churches [as before noticed, they were allowed to continue in the old churches], but *without claiming any other meaning than that of a communion-table.*" In a note he remarks, "*Table of the Lord* is the proper biblical expression (1 Cor. x. 21; compare Heb. ix. 2). The first Christians, it is well known, had no altars."*

DOES THE NEW OR MERCERSBURG THEOLOGY TEACH OTHERWISE?

Let us see. An altar, in the view of Roman Catholics and Puseyite (or High Church) Episcopalians, is the specially holy place in the church. A special sacredness is attached to it, because

* A year or more ago, we read an article in the *Reformed Church Messenger* from a correspondent, in which he compliments a previous writer, presumably another correspondent (for we have neither of the numbers of the paper at hand, and speak from memory), on having triumphantly proved that the removing of the altar in the churches in this country and putting in their place a table was an "innovation," and consequently "*anti-Reformed!*" I may not use the correspondent's exact words, but I am sure I give the substance. I have no recollection whatever of seeing the article with its triumphant proofs, and can only surmise what they must have been,—probably the removal of square *wooden* things yclept altars, but which *were* no altars, and which the people and their ministers most assuredly did not regard as such in the sacrificial sense. After what we have allowed some of our Reformed standards and other authorities to testify on the subject of the altar on the foregoing pages, we are inclined to think that the triumphant proof was probably of the kind which a certain young pulpit orator years ago furnished. He boldly announced that he would (1) explain and show where the wind *came from*, (2) whither it *went*, and (3) that, as nobody had ever seen the wind, it was more than probable that nobody knew *whence it came or whither it went!*

only from *it* should intercession be made or prayer for the people be offered. It should be an altar in form as well as in fact: hence the great zeal which some of our younger brethren display to have the "puritanic table" removed and the right sort of thing substituted therefor. Hence we have had a profusion of articles in our Church periodical on the subject in time past, long before it was clearly declared what *was included* in the *altar-service*.

This term, *altar-service*, is of itself sufficiently significant. It tells any one who is acquainted with High-Church Lutheran or High-Church English writers that it means immensely more than some more or less multifarious liturgical forms or ritual ceremonials. A mere outward service of this sort might be nothing more than a matter of taste,—something æsthetical, perhaps. But in ecclesiastical language that word has a peculiar, fixed, and definite meaning. It includes the sacrificial and priestly view to which we have referred at some length. The altar *belongs* to that, and is in harmonious accord with it, and with no other view. Dr. Nevin well understood this when he used that term in his tract before the Liturgy made its public appearance. Perhaps few, comparatively, among our ministers then understood it; many do not now,—if we may judge from their declarations that there are no

doctrines enunciated in the Liturgy, especially in the new Order of Worship, which go beyond the confessional system of the Reformed Church. That this is so is, however, confessed by Dr. Nevin himself, nor was he at fault on that account, although it might perhaps have been expected from him that he should have more fully advertised his unsuspecting brethren and the Church at large of the fact. He said frankly that *his* idea of a liturgy was that of an *altar-liturgy*. That should have been sufficient to tell every one of us what was comprehended in his plan of a liturgy. But it was not. And when a few of us hinted even that a *great deal* was meant by it, we were looked upon as "enemies of Dr. N.," and I know not what else.

In his "Vindication of the New Liturgy," Dr. Nevin says:

"I may say that I hardly expected or wished the Synod to fall in with the *high view of altar-worship* presented in the tract" (p. 33).

Again: "The idea of an altar-liturgy was declared [by him] to be alone worthy of respect."

He says "the Synod knew perfectly well where the committee [of the Liturgy] stood in regard to the whole subject."

Here, we think, he is mistaken, and just this *not understanding* the full import of what was comprehended in an altar-liturgy on the part

of the great majority both of ministers and people at that time, laid the foundation of the great troubles afterwards. But of this it is not our purpose to speak.

It was an altar-liturgy that was intended to be prepared, not a "mere pulpit-liturgy," says Dr. Nevin, "a collection of dry forms [but must the forms necessarily be *dry* because not read at the altar?] for the use of the minister, in the usual style of such mechanical helps. It was something altogether different from that. It carried with it the spirit and power of a true altar-liturgy, . . . not simply a scheme of religious service, but a scheme also of religious thought and belief materially at variance with preconceived opinion in certain quarters" [rather, at variance with the doctrinal faith and standard of the Reformed Church, as it is elsewhere also candidly acknowledged to be].*

No one, we think, will undertake to say that an altar-liturgy, with all that it includes, was ever intended by the Synod in Norristown, in 1849, when it first appointed the committee to prepare a new Liturgy; no one, after the decided, clear, ringing testimony of the early standards and other authorities of the Reformed Church

* Dr. Nevin says of the Western Liturgy that "it lacks the very centre of all liturgical worship, namely, a true central altar-sacrifice." This is speaking out manfully in words of "no uncertain sound."

which have been adduced (and which might be increased tenfold), will dare to say that such was the "worship of our fathers." There was not one Reformed congregation three hundred years ago, and there is not one *now* on the continent of Europe, which has used or is now using such an altar-liturgy, with all that is included in it, in the sense and meaning as held by Dr. Nevin and those who hold his views on the subject under consideration. This may seem a sweeping declaration, but we challenge a contradiction.

Seeing, then, what is meant by an altar-liturgical service, it is not surprising that the Reformers in the sixteenth century, and the framers of the standards of the Church, and later evangelical writers down to the present time, so earnestly lifted up their voices against the altar. They, also, comprehended fully its meaning. It meant the human priesthood; it meant the sacrifice; it meant the priest clothed with power and authority, all in some sense akin to, if not in full measure with, that which obtains in the Roman Catholic Church. There they had seen its workings in perfection, and they felt in the very depth of their souls that the Reformation would have no meaning and could not be justified if the main prop and pillar of the Papacy—*the priesthood with its altar and sacrifice*—were suffered to

stand intact. Hence their outspoken opposition to it. (For a truly masterly delineation of the PAPAL SYSTEM, see some extracts in the Appendix (I.) from Dr. Dorner's Essay read before the Evangelical Alliance in New York.)

The editor of the New York *Christian Intelligencer* (Reformed Dutch) says on this subject:

. . . "We do offer to God spiritual sacrifice when we offer devout worship to Him, but these acts of prayer and praise cannot be laid upon any table or altar which is open to human inspection. The heart is the altar from which they ascend. These acts in their very nature are spiritual, and the addition of any material object seems to us to be irrelevant. 'God is a spirit, and they that worship Him must worship in spirit and in truth.' It is all true that public worship needs forms of expression. It is designed to find utterance in words; but the simplest forms of speech are as acceptable as the most elaborate of liturgies, when they proceed from a heart filled with the love of God. In using symbols for the furtherance of public devotion, we must have New Testament warrant for the adoption of any rite or the introduction of any emblematic device. Rome has adopted the altar in order to keep prominently before her devotees the idea of the real presence in the offering up of the mass, which she calls the 'unbloody sacrifice of the mass.' With the special design of insisting upon the transubstantiation of the wafer into the real body and

blood of Christ, she sets up her *altars* in the buildings which are dedicated to the exercise of her forms of worship. The wafer, after the form of consecration in the use of which it is regarded as miraculously converted into the real, actual, living Christ, is called *the host*, *i.e.*, *hostia*, a victim, and our Lord is represented as being thus perpetually and repeatedly offered up as often as this ceremony is repeated. The use of the altar, under such circumstances, is especially significant, but apart from all such ideas the relevancy of this *furniture* is not easily understood. The usages of the Church of Rome indicate, as it seems to us, that our Lord is *crucified afresh*, and such *acts of worship* cannot be acceptable, because they are manifestly in direct contradiction of the words of Holy Scripture. By that one sacrifice offered on Calvary, He has forever perfected them that are sanctified. That oblation cannot be repeated. It was the one great transaction in which all the sacrificial ceremonies of the old Jewish ritual found their completion. There remaineth no more sacrifice for sin, since Christ has died, except that one oblation which is of perpetual efficacy; and therefore the use of the altar apart from all affinity with such views is not relevant."

AN ALTAR-LITURGY INCONSISTENT WITH THE GENIUS AND CUSTOMS OF THE REFORMED CHURCH.

We have already shown that the doctrines contained in the Liturgy ("Order of Wor-

ship") are not in accordance with the teachings of the Heidelberg Catechism. But, apart from the doctrinal departure, a most serious objection holds against that book, more even than to its predecessor, the Provisional Liturgy, because of its complicated and constrained ceremonial. The Reformed Church never worshiped according to anything of the sort. That there were forms of prayer and other services prepared during the Reformation period, not only by Luther, Zwingle, Calvin, and even by Knox (in Scotland), we know full well—none of them, however, in the style of the "Order of Worship;" but we know, also, that those forms, which were retained at first from expediency, soon came to be distasteful to the people, and hence, with the exception of a few prayers and sacramental forms, etc., were very soon out of use in public worship. A full responsive service, away from the gorgeous cathedral or similar surroundings, is in fact out of place. It is not in harmony with Protestant houses of worship and with the genius of the Protestant Church, in which, although too much preponderance may often have been given to preaching and too little to prayer and praise, yet, thank God, the preaching of the word is, and ought to be, according to the word of God and the examples of the Apostles, the central part

of the worship in God's house. In proportion as ritualism is made prominent, the sermon will fall into the background,—the pulpit will be overshadowed by the altar,—an evidence of which, in its incipiency, is already showing itself in the utterances and even in some cases in the practice in some quarters in our own Church. Now, we say that this style of worship is new and strange in the Reformed Church. Neither in Germany, Switzerland, France, Holland, nor, indeed, anywhere else, have we seen or heard anything of the kind. And we are confident in our own mind that it never will, it never can be ingrafted upon the Reformed Church in this country. You may get people here and there to submit to it, they may unthinkingly agree to it to please the preacher, or some may even be made to believe that it is "worshiping as the fathers did," and that it is therefore according to the "genius and spirit of the Church a hundred years ago" (which is simply not so); but as for a hearty acceptance and adoption, it will, we are fully persuaded, never be done. You may get an organ and a choir to go through certain portions of the service, and you may have faint-hearted responses here and there, but the *great mass of the people* will eschew it. And then what is gained by any such forced method

of introducing the Liturgy? Heart-burnings, distractions, confusion, and all manner of evil fruits. A few only of our congregations use the service in full now, after years of effort to introduce it; and are these benefited by it, even in an external way? It seems not. And as for the *German* portion of the Church—by far the largest portion yet—whether native or foreign born, we know not of a single congregation which has expressed the desire to have a full liturgical service. Indeed, the Liturgy has only quite recently been translated into German, a proof that it was not called for, and we predict that the book will lie on the shelf for a long time, and then scarcely find entrance into any number of German congregations. This was our conviction thirteen years ago, when we were appointed one of a committee to translate the Provisional Liturgy into the German language, before we were fully aware of the objectionable doctrinal contents of the book. On that account we afterwards declined to serve on the committee, and the Synod, after waiting one or more years, finally dropped the matter, and only recently had the work published.

Dr. Nevin has declared more than once that it did not seem to meet with favor, and had therefore better be given up. But some others

were fully bent, it seems, on pushing matters to an extreme, and by their actions, if not by their words, seemed to say that they would rather see the institutions at Lancaster given up, and general disaster to the Church ensue, than give up the Liturgy.

Now we ask brethren, why this uncalled-for zeal to force upon the Church (for it is, after all, force in some form) a liturgical service which is foreign to our custom and genius as a denomination? For most assuredly it is foreign in both these respects, although it has been denied again and again, we charitably hope from ignorance rather than from a worse motive. This we shall now try to substantiate from the admissions and confessions of the principal author of the Liturgy, Dr. Nevin.

In his tract on the "Liturgical Question," he says that it was constructed on a different plan from any of the Liturgies of the Reformed Church (p. 39). And in the following pages are these words (the italicizing is our own):

"It is to be fully admitted that there lay in the *distinguishing* spirit of the Reformed Confessions, as such, from the beginning, a tendency in opposition to the *constraint of fixed religious rites and ceremonies*, which could hardly fail to exert an injurious influence on any work of this sort [an altar-liturgy]. It belonged, as we all know, to the Reformed Church, to represent

that side of the Christian life in which the inward, the free, the spiritual in religion are asserted against the authority of the merely outward in every view. Such is her historical vocation,—such her genius." Again, on page 50 he says, speaking of the Provisional Liturgy, "It has not professed at all to be of one order simply with the liturgical practice of the German Reformed Church of the sixteenth century, and much less of one order with what had come to be its liturgical practice in the eighteenth century, when it was first transplanted to this country. That practice, from the beginning, is believed to have been too naked and bald, running naturally into the theory which makes a liturgy to be a book of outward forms and nothing more. The new Liturgy was constructed throughout on another theory altogether,—the theory of an *altar-service*, in distinction from what may be called a service simply of the pulpit.—It makes common cause with the Liturgies of the ancient Church.—*It breathes throughout a sacrificial spirit*." (Page 51.) "The Reformed Confession from the beginning has not been favorable to much outward form or ritual action in worship; and its liturgical productions have all along been more in sympathy with the pulpit than the altar." (Page 60). "It requires no argument to show that it is not after the pattern strictly of any system of worship which has prevailed hitherto in the German Reformed Church, either in this country or in Europe. It makes no such profession or pretense. *If, then, we want no such innovation upon the old system,*

. . . it is most certain, without further question, that the new Liturgy, as it now stands, is not what we need, or should be willing to receive. It is a question of very *material change* in our *Church practice*, if not in *our Church life*. The new Liturgy is for us as a Church in many respects *a new scheme of worship. It is not the pattern according to which our fathers worshiped, either in these United States, or elsewhere.*" (Page 62.) Again, "We can never be satisfied with the Old Palatinate Liturgy, nor with any of the Helvetic Liturgies used in the sixteenth century, or since; and still less, of course, with any of the jejune formularies that were used by our ministerial fathers of the last century here in America. No reconstruction of any such order of worship will serve our purpose." (Page 71.)

Let this suffice to show that an altar-liturgy is *not* after the pattern of the Reformed Church in any period of her history. It needs no further proof, an abundance of which we have lying before us, to substantiate this, especially as it is so fully and unequivocally acknowledged by the highest authority. Dr. Nevin himself. Only let none of the younger brethren hereafter use the argument that the use of a liturgy, of an *altar-liturgy*, in the Church is "only going back to the usages of the old Reformed Church as it used to be," or that it is "merely reviving old customs which Puritanism or Methodism had

for a time brought into disuse." We forbear to characterize such declarations as they justly deserve. There is not a shadow of fact to sustain them. Just in the same way it has been maintained, even by theological teachers, in regard to the new *doctrinal* position, of which we may, by way of example, quote but a single sentence: "If the doctrinal position concerning the Liturgy is once understood," says Dr. Apple, in the *Messenger*, on "False Alarms,"—"if it is once understood that that position is none other than the Church *has all along maintained*, a large portion of the wind will be taken out of the sails of those who oppose it." Now let the candid reader refer to the frank confessions made by Dr. Nevin and others, quoted in previous pages in this book and elsewhere, in which there is avowed an utter and entire renunciation of all past and present "reigning Protestantism," and we think "the wind will be taken out of the sails" of Dr. Apple to a degree that must bring his craft to a dead stop.

Yes, verily! "It is a question of very *material change* in our Church practice, if not in our CHURCH LIFE. . . . It is not the pattern according to which our fathers worshiped, either in these United States, or elsewhere." So says Dr. Nevin; and he knows what he says, and says what he knows.

Let this be understood, then, once for all, without further debate or controversy. The sophistical Mephistopheles, in Goethe's Faust, misled the poor young man who came to him for the arcana of knowledge, when he said to him to "stick to his *words* if he would pass through the gate into the temple of certainty;" and when the young man said something about the importance of having some *truth* or some *meaning* connected with words, his teacher glossed over in a most wretched way his sophistry, by telling the young man, with wonderful assurance,—

"Schon gut! Nur muss man sich nicht allzu ängstlich quälen;
Denn eben wo *Begriffe* fehlen,
Da stellt ein *Wort* zur rechten Zeit sich ein.
Mit Worten lässt sich trefflich streiten,
Mit Worten ein System bereiten,
An Worte lässt sich trefflich glauben,
Von einem Wort lässt sich kein Iota rauben."

Let our brethren on the other side frankly acknowledge, "This is essentially a new thing, such as the Reformed Church never before had, even so far as the outward form of it is concerned, but we believe it is *better* than the old, and therefore we want you to permit your ministers to introduce it."

That would be candid, honest, truthful. And if the *people wish to have it*, if they "long for it," as has been said, if the great mass of our church-members show that it is in harmony with their convictions and feelings, then, in

God's name, let them have it, and we will answer with a loud, responsive AMEN! But, on the other hand, if such is not the case, then we beseech brethren, for the love of God and of Christ, for the peace and prosperity of the Church, and for the sake of that charity which never faileth, to desist from their endeavors by this and that means to obtain an unwilling submission to that which, if their whole heart is not in it, must prove the very opposite of true worship, and so must prove displeasing in the sight of God and of good men.

THE SACRAMENTS.

We have shown with sufficient clearness, we hope, that the new theory taught in Mercersburg and Lancaster is of such a radical character that it necessarily affects the whole range of Christian doctrine. Hence it must, as a matter of course, affect also the important subject of the sacraments.

Let us then see, in the first place, what is the teaching of the Reformed Church on the sacraments in general, and then on each one of the two sacraments in particular. We quote from the Catechism:

"*Quest.* 65. Since then we are made partakers of Christ and all His benefits by faith only, whence does this faith proceed?

"*Ans.* From the Holy Ghost, who works faith in our hearts by the preaching of the gospel, *and confirms it by the use of the sacraments.*

" *Quest.* 66. What are the sacraments?

"*Ans.* The sacraments are holy visible signs and seals appointed of God for this end, that by the use thereof He may *the more fully declare and seal to us the promise of the gospel*, to wit, that He grants us freely the remission of sin, and life eternal, for the sake of that one sacrifice of Christ accomplished on the cross.

"*Quest.* 67. Are both word and sacraments ordained and appointed for this end, that they may direct our faith to the sacrifice of Jesus Christ on the cross as the only ground of our salvation?

"*Ans.* Yes, indeed; for the Holy Ghost teaches us in the gospel, and assures us by the sacraments, *that the whole of our salvation depends upon that one sacrifice of Christ which He offered for us on the cross.*"

Here, then, we have a clear statement of the nature of the sacraments, and also of the *connection* which exists between faith and the sacraments. In the first of the foregoing answers we are told that the Holy Ghost works faith in our hearts by the preaching of the gospel, and (in the language of Ursinus) "cherishes, confirms, and seals it by the use of the sacraments. The word is a charter, to which the sacraments are attached as signs. The charter is the gospel itself, to which the sacraments are affixed as the

seals of the Divine will. Whatever the word promises concerning our salvation through Christ, that the sacraments, as signs and seals annexed thereto, confirm unto us more and more for the purpose of helping our infirmity." (Comment., p. 340.)

It will thus be seen that, according to Reformed doctrine, the sacraments are not in and of themselves efficacious to salvation. It is *faith* that saves. The sacraments are "holy visible *signs and seals* appointed of God for this end, that by the use thereof He may *the more fully declare and seal to us the promise of the gospel*, to wit, that He grants us freely [that which the word has already assured to us] the remission of sin, and life eternal, for the sake of that one sacrifice of Christ accomplished on the cross."

"We are made partakers of Christ and all His benefits [not in or by baptism, but] by *faith only*." The answer to Question 32, "Why art thou called a Christian?" is in this clear and unequivocal form: "Because I am a member of Christ [not by baptism, but] *by faith*." There is much more to the same effect which could be adduced in our incomparable Catechism, which the more we study the more we admire and love it. But let this suffice. The Catechism does not teach that forgiveness of sins, the grace of

salvation, or the new spiritual life (regeneration), is *bound* to the rite of baptism.

This is the teaching also of all the standards of the Reformed Church. Let us listen to one or two of these out of many:

The Confession of Brandenburg (Prussia): "Therefore baptism is called the bath of regeneration, and consequently also that of the covenant and adoption (*Kindschaft*) of God, because it is a sign and seal of such grace of God. And this grace is as sure to us who believe [not who are *baptized*] as certainly as we are baptized, according to the promise, Whosoever believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (See also the Palatinate Baptism Formulary.)

Dr. Heppe, the able Reformed theologian, in setting forth the old Reformed doctrine, which it is confessed on all sides that he has done with great impartiality, says:

"The reception of the grace, the communication of which is attested and sealed through baptism, is *not bound to the outward act* and to the moment of the sacramental transaction, because the efficacy of baptism rather presupposes the faith and conversion of men as already at hand." (Much more to the same effect might be quoted from this learned living author.)

Calvin, speaking of the Catholics, who attri-

bute to the sacraments all kinds of hidden virtues by which justification and grace are conferred, says:

"It is impossible to express the pestilent and fatal effects of this opinion. . . . Yea, it is manifestly diabolical, because, by promising justification without faith, it hurries souls into destruction. . . . We see this exemplified in the centurion [Cornelius], who, *after* having received the remission of his sins and the visible graces of the Holy Spirit, was baptized, not with a view of obtaining through baptism a more complete remission of sins, but a stronger exercise of faith and an increase of confidence from that pledge (Acts x. 44–48). Perhaps it is objected, Why then did Ananias say to Paul, 'Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins'? I answer, we are said to receive or obtain that which our faith apprehends, as presented to us by the Lord, whether at the time when He first declared it to us, or when, by a subsequent testimony, He affords us a more certain confirmation of it."

Now, what are the views of the Mercersburg-Lancaster school on this subject? Do they conform to the foregoing clearly-expressed views of the Reformed Church, or do they not?

Before quoting the language of the new theory on baptism, the reader must remember the peculiar view which lies back of it as its

groundwork, in order to understand fully the "reason of things" in their connections.

Let it be remembered, then, that redemption, according to the new theory, is brought to man (we quote Dr. Nevin's language) "by an *organic conjunction* with the Saviour, in a way that makes Him to be the actual life-principle of their new Christian being, and shows their life to be mysteriously involved in His from the commencement to its close. . . . Religion, to be real, must be in some way a community of life with God, . . . an inward conjunction in a real way, . . . an incorporation of this higher element into the actual onflowing life of the world." (Language, this, which sounds strange to the ear that has not been familiar with the theosophic system of Jacob Böhme or the writings of the school of the pantheist Spinoza.)

Now, in consistency with such a view of redemption is Tract No. 3, acknowledged to be by one of the professors in Lancaster, in which it is said that

"All the benefits of Christ are received, *not by faith*, not through previous knowledge of our misery, not in the way of repentance and faith, but through baptism, and through baptism exclusively." And again: "There is no way in which a man can be created anew by the Spirit, according to the established economy of salva-

tion, but by baptism." And again: "A sinner may be penitent for his sins, but until he has received baptism, as God's act of remission to him, he has no true assurance of remission. And when after baptism he sins through infirmity, he cannot be sure of pardon till his absolution is spoken, signed, and sealed by Christ, by the means of a Divine act through the Church."

Another writer of respectable standing on the same side, in speaking of baptism, holds the following singular language:

"It is, in a few words, the implantation of the germ or principle of a new or spiritual life from Christ, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, brought to pass in connection with the proper use of the outward sign" (baptism).

Our honored father used to tell us that if we had one or two good, clear, unmistakable proofs in favor of any point, it was as valid as twenty or fifty, and, besides, saved time. We leave the reader to look for himself "on this picture, and then on this," and judge whether this new theory does or does not square with the teachings of the Reformed Church. And this is all that we intended. We did not design to enter upon any discussion as to the merits or demerits of the new theory here. We say nothing in reference to the question what the sacraments

are in an objective way. We believe, with the Reformed Church, that they are *more* than mere outward signs, yea, that there is an offer of grace tendered through them. But we waive all that, and have fulfilled our task if we have succeeded in showing that, so far at least as baptism is concerned, our brethren of Lancaster teach another system altogether on the subject from that of our standards and of all Reformed theologians.* And that is enough for us for

---

* Dr. Nevin, in his "Vindication of the Liturgy" (p. 89), quotes from the French Reformed divine Pressensé, with approbation, his saying, "It is impossible to establish the necessity of infant baptism, except upon the ground that baptism imparts a special grace;" and then Dr. Nevin adds, "We are decidedly of the same opinion, and for this reason we denounce this theology [the anti-liturgical theology he calls it] as in reality . . . hostile to infant baptism." (Just before he characterized it as "Pelagian," landing us swiftly in downright Rationalism.)

Now we, too, are "decidedly of the same opinion" with the eminent and good Pressensé; and as we had the privilege of personally knowing him and his views on this and other theological subjects, and, moreover, have read some of his works, we can assure Dr. Nevin that if he agreed fully with the entire theological system of that divine, including the subject of baptism, there would be no need of any controversy in our Reformed Church. This is one way of seeking comfort from European theologians. So Dr. Apple refers to the "excellent Dr. Christlieb's" address at the Alliance over against our American theology on the subject of inspiration, when in fact hardly a respectable theologian of this country could be found who holds essentially a different view from that incidentally touched upon by Dr. C. But it cannot have escaped Dr. Apple that the excellent Christlieb's entire stand-point in theology is an out-and-out opposition to the new theory. So with Dr. Nevin and Dr. Pressensé. This eminent man holds good Reformed doctrine on other subjects as well as on the subject of baptism, and

the present. If they, in their judgment, think that they have discovered something deeper and better from pre-Reformation authors, if they choose to sit at the feet and learn of men in the fourth and sixth centuries rather than of those of the sixteenth, they have a natural right to do so. But we submit that they have no *moral* right in the case. As ministers, and especially as teachers of theology, they are solemnly sworn as by a solemn oath to expound the fundamental doctrines of the gospel as explained and taught in the Reformed Church. If they cannot do this, they should have no difficulty in seeing what their duty is in such circumstances.* We ought

---

every Reformed minister can say Amen to them. But Dr. N. can rest assured that he repudiates *in toto* his entire system, just as Dorner and Liebner and others have been found to do when it comes to the marrow of things, and not merely to some non-essential "points."

* The following is the form prescribed in the Constitution:

"At his inauguration a professor elect shall solemnly affirm the following declaration, as by an oath, in the presence of God, in a public assembly:

"You, N. N., professor elect of the Theological Seminary of the German Reformed Church in the United States, acknowledge sincerely before God and this assembly, that the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, which are called canonical Scriptures, are genuine, authentic, inspired, and therefore Divine Scriptures; that they contain all things which relate to the faith, the practice, and the hope of the righteous, and are the only rule of faith and practice in the Church of God; that, consequently, no traditions, as they are called, and no mere conclusions of reason, which are contrary to the clear testimony of these Scriptures, can be received as rules of faith or of life. You acknowledge, further, that the doctrine contained in the Heidelberg Catechism is the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, and must, therefore, be received as in accordance with Divinely-revealed truth. You

perhaps not to dismiss this subject without some reference to the form of baptism in the new Order of Worship, in which, of course, the same views are brought forward to which we have just referred. In the introduction the congregation is requested to call upon God, "that of His bounteous mercy He may grant to this child, *through the holy sacrament of baptism*, that which by nature *he* cannot have; that being washed from his sins, and delivered from the power of the devil, he may be made a member," etc.

And again, when addressing the parents:

"You present this child here, and do seek for him deliverance from the power of the devil, the remission of sin, and the gift of a new and spiritual life by the Holy Ghost, *through the sacrament of baptism, which Christ hath ordained for the communication of such great grace.*"—And similarly also in the closing prayer.

No further remarks are necessary on this point. But that which strikes us as unusual

---

declare sincerely, that in the office you are about to assume, you will make the inviolable Divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, and the truth of the doctrine contained in the Heidelberg Catechism, the basis of all your instructions, and faithfully maintain and defend the same, in your preaching and writing, as well as in your instructions; you declare, finally, that you will labor, according to the ability which God may grant to you, that, with the Divine blessing, the students entrusted to your care may become enlightened, pious, faithful, and zealous ministers of the gospel, who shall be sound in the faith."

and strange in a baptismal form in a Reformed book is the phraseology brought out in several particulars, especially the words "delivered from the power of the devil," and "You present this child here, and do seek for him deliverance from the power of the devil," etc.

We say this is unusual and strange in this connection. We know very well that those who urge its use charge those who object to it with Pelagianism,—that is, that they are tainted with low and unsound views on the subject of human depravity. Professor Rust was charged in this way, and, although he disavowed the charge in the most emphatic manner, the charge was repeated in the most unceremonious terms against that excellent man.

Now, every reader of Church history knows that an extreme party in the Lutheran Church, in the seventeenth century, reinstated the popish ceremony of *exorcism* (*Austreibung des Teufels*); and hence they used those words in the form of baptism. In Germany a small number of ultra-Lutherans have again attempted, not indeed to introduce exorcism in form, but to interlard the form of baptism with the words just as in the Order of Worship; but it created such a storm of opposition, even among the "faithful few," that the innovation has, so far as we learn, been abandoned, after

first causing a division among the hyper-orthodox brethren themselves.

The Reformed Church has ever protested against anything that looked in that direction. The Bremen Confession of 1595, speaking of exorcism, says that it

"Strengthens many and great errors which should not by any means be suffered in the true Church of God. For if plain people hear that the devil is adjured in children, . . . what else can they think but that children are possessed of the devil? But if it should be said that it refers to the spiritual tyranny of Satan, still the Scriptures speak only of reprobates, who have been given over to a perverse mind, and in whom Satan is mighty as in 'the children of disobedience,' that they are possessed of the devil. And it is one thing to be subjected to the power of original sin, and another thing to be spiritually possessed of the devil. Although all men are by nature children of wrath, and therefore of and for themselves subjected to the spiritual tyranny of Satan on account of original sin, yet it is otherwise with the children of believers, according to the special grace of God, through which such children belong to the covenant wherein Divine favor and the kingdom of heaven are promised to them; and just as the wrath of God does not reign over them, so also is there no reigning power over them left to the devil." (See Appendix J.)

This is discriminating and just, in making a

distinction between original sin and being under the power of the devil. And whether anything of Satanic possession is intended or not in the Liturgy, it is a most harsh and unjustifiable use of language, such as was never in vogue in the Reformed Church, and which, with the writer's view, deeply as he feels and knows what heights and depths of sin there are in the human heart, he could and would never employ, and therefore he can only feel regret that it should ever have found a place in that book.

Moreover, as Dr. Dorner very justly remarks, "according to the Palatinate Liturgy the requirement of antecedent or subsequent penitent faith, in opposition to a magical efficacy, should not have been omitted. Besides, there is something unequal [*eine Unebenheit*] in Nevin's expressing himself in the strongest terms upon the guilt and damnableness of original sin as the ground for the baptism of infants, whilst in the doctrine of justification the forgiveness of sins does not occupy the independent position as a turning-point" (in that doctrine).

Very naturally and consistently with that view is that of clinical or lay baptism (*Nothtaufe*), which rests on the idea of a magical efficacy in its performance. Hence it is that in the Roman Catholic Church, and with some of

the ultra-Lutherans, a midwife may perform that rite,—nay, even Jews and Turks have performed it on sick or dying children, and it was pronounced valid by the Church and her priests!

The Reformed Church has always abhorred such a view, and we are well persuaded that our people will never submit to any such *fetichism* as this.

"But no one in the Reformed Church teaches any such view." We are happy to say that we know of no one who does. And yet there is a "tendency" which seems to look in that direction on the part of leading men in the Church. Their views of baptism *must* lead them to clinical baptism. And we know how many grave speeches were made in its favor at the Synod in Danville and the following year in Mechanicsburg. Did not brethren with great apparent solemnity declare that they could not rest contented in their minds if a child of theirs should pass out of the world unbaptized, and that if no minister were at hand they would let any one else baptize them? It was found, however, that the time had not yet come for that, and so it was *postponed.* We will close these remarks with an extract from a learned and well-known Reformed clergyman in Germany, who was informed of the discussions at the

Mechanicsburg Synod through a young German then in this country. He says:

"And your Synod discussed the question of the *Nothtaufe* in all true seriousness! Verily, that is a significant sign of the times, and for the REFORMED CHURCH! I doubt whether our *alt-Lutheraner* here in Silesia, even, could muster twenty men who would dare to broach such a dogma publicly,—the men who say of us (Reformed) that we *have* no baptism—who won't allow any but their own stripe to commune with them, and who would almost as soon allow Mephistopheles to preach in their pulpits as they would allow you or me. One of *these* ultra-High-Church ecclesiastics said to me when I mentioned to him the fact as above: 'That is truly wonderful!'—Yes, I must repeat it: that you could even *discuss* such a theme, is a significant [*significantes*] sign of the times, and tells me that the 'matin bells of Rome' must have been ringing in Pennsylvania. Do write and tell me whether such chimes have any charm for *you*."

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

THE writer of these pages has no heart to enter at any length upon a discussion of this subject in its purely dogmatical form. He considers the Lord's Supper one of the most tender, holy, and blessed ordinances of Christianity, one in which all the love of God and the Lord Jesus Christ concentres, in which the believer has the nearest approach to the very heart of his Father, where, like the disciple who leaned on Jesus' bosom, he too is permitted, as it were, to lean lovingly, confidingly, and with an humble boldness. It is, therefore, a hallowed subject, one which the mind in a tender frame does not feel like profaning by controversial discussion. Nothing can be more sad to a devout heart than the fact that the very ordinance which was designed, among other things, to symbolize the love and fellowship of all true Christians with one another and with Christ their blessed Lord and Master should have been made the occasion of heart-burnings and bitter strifes. Well may we cry out, with a lovely departed servant of

Christ,* "Oh for a cycle of peace! Oh for a breathing-spell from these unnatural contentions! I feel as if I could join with any who would humbly unite in direct and kind efforts to save sinners and relieve human misery. Cannot a poor believer go along in his pilgrimage heavenward without being always on military duty? At judgment I heartily believe that some heresies of *heart and temper* will be charged as worse than heavy doctrinal errors. To you I may say this, because you understand me as holding, not merely that the tenets of our Church are true, but that they are very important. But I see how easy it is to 'hold the truth' in rancor and hate, which is the grand error of depraved human nature, yea, and of diabolism itself." There is much force in this remark, and it has an important bearing on our subject. There may be, there *are*, no doubt, some whose views of this holy ordinance are too low, and yet they may have all the benefits and blessings for their spiritual well-being notwithstanding. And God forbid that we should therefore denounce those as outside of the pale of Christ's Church whom He has received, and who show forth in their lives and conduct the image and spirit of the Redeemer. Still, it is important

* The Rev. Dr. James W. Alexander, in his "Familiar Letters," vol. i., 1860.

that we should have Scriptural views of truth, and that these be neither mere notions or dry dogmas on the one side, nor fanciful or superstitious speculations on the other.

We shall, therefore, as already intimated, deal very briefly with the dogmatical statement of the subject on either side, whilst we shall furnish evidence of a satisfactory nature, as we humbly trust, that the commonly-received truths on the subject of the Eucharist are fully in accordance with the teachings of the Heidelberg Catechism and the word of God as these have been held in the Reformed Church, and that the views as brought out in the Liturgy and elsewhere by the new theory are not in accordance with the faith of our Church and the word of God.

And first of all we will bring forward the Catechism as a witness in regard to the teachings of the Church on this point, so that the reader may not need to lay aside the book for the purpose of reference. (The reader may also refer to Questions 65, 66, and 67 in the Catechism, which have already been quoted.)

"*Quest.* 75. How art thou admonished and assured in the Lord's Supper that thou art a partaker of that one sacrifice of Christ, accomplished on the cross, and of all His benefits?

"*Ans.* Thus, that Christ has commanded me, and all believers, to eat of this broken bread,

and to drink of this cup, in remembrance of Him; adding these promises, first, that His body was offered and broken on the cross for me, and His blood shed for me, as certainly as I see with my eyes the bread of the Lord broken for me, and the cup communicated to me: and further, that He feeds and nourishes my soul to everlasting life, with His crucified body and shed blood, as assuredly as I receive from the hands of the minister and taste with my mouth the bread and cup of the Lord, as certain signs of the body and blood of Christ.

"*Quest.* 76. What is it then to eat the crucified body and drink the shed blood of Christ?

"*Ans.* It is not only to embrace with a believing heart all the sufferings and death of Christ, and thereby to obtain the pardon of sin and life eternal; but also, beside that, to become more and more united to His sacred body, by the Holy Ghost, who dwells both in Christ and in us; so that we, although Christ is in heaven and we on earth, are, notwithstanding, 'flesh of His flesh and bone of His bone;' and that we live and are governed forever by one Spirit, as members of the same body are by one soul.

"*Quest.* 77. Where has Christ promised that He will as certainly feed and nourish believers with His body and blood, as they eat of this broken bread and drink of this cup?

"*Ans.* In the institution of the Supper, which is thus expressed: 'The Lord Jesus, in the same night in which He was betrayed, took bread,' etc. (1 Cor. xi. 23–26; Matt. xxvi. 26; Heb. ix. 20).

"This promise is repeated by the holy Apostle Paul, where he says, 'The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? for we, being many, are one bread and one body; because we are all partakers of that one bread' (1 Cor. x. 16, 17).

"*Quest.* 78. Do then the bread and wine become the very body and blood of Christ?

"*Ans.* Not at all; but as the water in baptism is not changed into the blood of Christ, neither is the washing away of sin itself, being only the sign and confirmation thereof appointed of God; so the bread of the Lord's Supper is not changed into the very body of Christ, though, agreeably to the nature and properties of sacraments, it is called the body of Christ Jesus.

"*Quest.* 79. Why then doth Christ call the bread His body, and the cup His blood, or the new covenant in his blood; and Paul the 'communion of the body and blood of Christ'?

"*Ans.* Christ speaks thus not without great reason, namely, not only thereby to teach us,

that as bread and wine support this temporal life, so His crucified body and shed blood are the true meat and drink whereby our souls are fed to eternal life; but more especially by these visible signs and pledges to assure us that we are as really partakers of His true body and blood (by the operation of the Holy Ghost) as we receive by the mouths of our bodies these holy signs in remembrance of Him; and that all His sufferings and obedience are as certainly ours, as if we had in our own persons suffered and made satisfaction for our sins to God.

"*Quest.* 80. What difference is there between the Lord's Supper and the Popish mass?

"*Ans.* The Lord's Supper testifies to us that we have a full pardon of all sin by the only sacrifice of Jesus Christ, which He Himself has once accomplished on the cross; and that we by the Holy Ghost are ingrafted into Christ, who, according to His human nature, is now not on earth, but in heaven, at the right hand of God His Father, and will there be worshiped by us: but the mass teacheth that the living and the dead have not the pardon of sins, through the sufferings of Christ, unless Christ is also daily offered for them by the priests; and further, that Christ is bodily under the form of bread and wine, and therefore is to be worshiped

in them ;* so that the mass, at bottom, is nothing else than a denial of the one sacrifice and sufferings of Jesus Christ, and an accursed idolatry."

On the first of these answers Ursinus has a long exposition, to which we refer the reader.† For the benefit of those who do not possess this work, we append the following extracts:

"It is called the *Lord's Supper*, from the circumstance of its first institution. . . . Paul calls it the *Lord's Table*. It is also called a *covenant* or *assembly*, from the fact that in the celebration of this supper there must be some, whether few or many, that meet together for this purpose. . . . This sacrament, therefore, consists in the rite and the promise annexed to it, or in the signs and the things signified. The *rite* or *signs* are the bread which is broken and the wine which is poured out and drunk. *The things signified* are the broken body and shed blood of Christ which are eaten and drunk, or our union with Christ by faith, by which we are made partakers of Christ and all His benefits, so that we derive from Him everlasting life, as the branches draw their life from the vine. We are assured of this our union and communion with Christ by the analogy which there is be-

* In canone missæ et de consecrat. distinct. 2 Concil. Trid., Sess. 13, 15.

† We sincerely recommend this invaluable "Commentary of Ursinus," not only to young ministers, but to all our Church members. No family should be without it. It is a large royal octavo volume of 658 pages, full of instruction for both young and old.

tween the sign and the thing signified, and also by the promise which is joined to the sign." [pp. 377, 378.]

THE DESIGN OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.—It was intended to be "a confirmation of our faith, or a most sure proof of our union and communion with Christ, who feeds us with His body and blood unto everlasting life, as truly as we receive these signs from the hands of the minister. This object is obtained by all those who receive these signs *in true faith:* for we so receive these signs from the hands of the minister, as if the Lord Himself gave them unto us with His own hand. It is in this way that Christ is said to have baptized more disciples than John, when He, nevertheless, did it through His disciples" (John iv. 1). [p. 379.]

In the exposition of Question 76,—

"This eating is that communion which we have with Christ, of which the Scriptures speak, and of which we make confession in the Creed, which consists *in a spiritual union with Christ,* as members with the head, and branches with the vine. Christ teaches this eating of His flesh in the sixth chapter of St. John, and confirms it in the Supper by external signs. It is in *this sense* that the ancient fathers, such as Augustine, Eusebius, Nazianzen, Hilary, and others, explain the eating of Christ's flesh. . . . It is plain, therefore, that neither the doctrine of transubstantiation, which the Papists advocate, nor a corporal presence of Christ and the eating of His body in the bread with the mouth, which

many defend, can be established from the language which is employed in reference to the Supper which promises the eating of Christ's body." [p. 382.]

(On this subject, as well as other points closely connected with it, see Appendix H for a masterly and truly edifying as well as instructive exposition.)

The Mercersburg theory, it is hardly necessary to say, proceeds on an entirely different system, being ruled by its theory of the Incarnation. As we have no system of theology written out, as yet, from our brethren who differ from us on all the other points which have been under review, and very little has been said in a direct way by them on this subject, it is, of course, not very easy to say what their exact views are. But the Liturgy contains points of such wide departure from the Palatinate and all other Reformed forms on the Lord's Supper, uses language so singularly strange and unusual, that our ears cannot but be pained by the great change. Thus, for instance, the well-known and hallowed phrases, "through the sufferings and death of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ"—"His broken body and shed blood"—are not found there. Why not? Dr. Nevin, in his "Vindication" (p. 92), says that the Liturgy "teaches that the Lord's Supper is

more than an outward sign, and more than a mere calling to mind of our Saviour's death as something past and gone,"—intimating that those in our Church whom he opposes did not hold, with the Catechism, that it was *more* than "an outward sign." He goes on to say: "It [the new theory] teaches that the value of Christ's sacrifice never dies, but is perennially continued in the power of His life; . . . the undying power of Christ's life is there in the transaction, for all who take part in it by faith." This grace we are to appropriate, "and to bring it before God (the 'memorial of the blessed sacrifice of His Son') as the only ground of our trust and confidence in His presence" (p. 93). Without this (mind, the "perennial," the "*memorial sacrifice*"), he says, we should have no sacraments—we should plunge into the "full abyss of Rationalism."

Well, then, the whole Protestant Church for three hundred and fifty years (except the fraction of Puseyites and ultra-Lutherans) are and have been "plunged" in this abyss: that's all! Every thing for Dr. N. looks towards a *sacrifice;* and although he repels the possible charge of holding anything so offensive as "the Roman Catholic so-called sacrifice of the mass," and although we are quite ready to accept his disclaimer, yet he must pardon us for saying

that the entire drift of the teaching on this and co-related subjects points to something so like that offensive thing that we wonder that a man of such acumen as Dr. N. should not avoid even the "very appearance of evil." We are the more readily confirmed in this belief from the fact that at least one of our foremost men, who stood in the new theory years ago, was most deeply exercised on this very subject of the Romish mass, and earnestly desired that he might be able to believe it. We doubt not that others have been exercised in the same way, and that their wish culminated or will yet culminate in its realization, in one form or another.

The idea of a *sacrifice* is there, and in a way that must grate upon every Protestant ear; and all the harsh epithets of "rationalism, spiritualism, and puritanism" are idle as the wind, and simply prove that those who use these epithets are fully aware that they are breasting the mighty current of evangelical Protestantism at fearful odds. The late meeting of the Evangelical Alliance has told them that there are a unity and power in our "*so-called* Protestantism" (!) which, thank God, show that it is not yet dead, albeit its funeral dirge has been sung never so often in doleful and whining tones.

To show what are the views of such a man

as Dr. Dorner on the sacramental form in the Liturgy, we give the following calm and considerate words as they are found in his "Liturgical Conflict:"

"But in the form for the *Lord's Supper*, which otherwise contains much that is beautiful, the idea of a sacrifice presented by the communicants stands forth in a manner which is forced, and which must be offensive to an evangelical ear. It is not according to Calvin, as N. supposes, but to the Greek Church, that God is implored to 'send down upon the elements the powerful benediction of His Holy Spirit, that they may be set apart from a common to a sacred and mystical use, and exhibit and represent with true effect the Body and Blood of His Son Jesus Christ, so that in the use of them we may be made, through the power of the Holy Ghost, to partake really and truly of His blessed *life*, whereby only we can be saved from death and raised to immortality at the last day.' (Nothing is said of the death of Christ.) On p. 176 of the new Liturgy, the chief point is: 'Cleanse our minds, we beseech Thee, by the inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit, that we, Thy redeemed people, drawing near unto Thee in these holy mysteries, with a true heart and undefiled conscience, in full assurance of faith, may offer unto Thee *an acceptable sacrifice* in righteousness;' and (on p. 181) it is required that this grace shall be appropriated, and that *the me-*

morial of the blessed sacrifice of His Son be offered unto God.

"All this shows that the Revised Liturgy contains many things which from the stand-point of the Evangelical Church must be pronounced objectionable and erroneous. Other things, even though they may admit of an evangelical sense, are expressed in strange terms, and should have been avoided to prevent natural offense. This is doubly necessary when the non-evangelical sense is the more obvious one and seeks to prop itself upon an entire theological system."

Here now we lay down our pen. God is our judge how much conflict it has cost us to use it at all. That introductory Letter was the solemn, decisive monitor and prompter to this undertaking. If any of our brethren shall feel tempted to deal harshly with us, we have made up our mind to bear it, and in no case to return railing for railing. We desire peace, and now in the eventide of our life more than ever we desire to pursue it. But we know that in the present state of things among us Truth is in order to Peace. We firmly believe that that truth has been in a measure forsaken by some of our brethren, and, unless they can honestly and conscientiously return to the truth from which they have swerved, *there can be no peace.* It is not we, but *they*, who have brought this trouble into the Reformed

Church. So we firmly believe; and they themselves admit it. They admit that their theory on all the points brought forward in this book is in many respects at variance, if not in direct conflict, with *the general faith of the evangelical Protestant Church.* From the bottom of our heart we love all Christ's true followers, whether found in this or that portion of Christ's kingdom, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, for God has His people also in this last. But in the Protestant Church is our ecclesiastical home. In the Reformed branch of it were we born and reared under the prayers and pious teachings of godly parents. In it were their ancestors reared, some of them in the honored ranks of the ministry and the civil service, others in the more humble and retired walks of life; but all, as the precious ancestral record has touchingly recorded it, "were a worthy, pious stock, true to the Church of their fathers, and true to their country in hours of trial and sorrow." My heart softens at the words as I read the certificate from the trembling hand of the venerable Westphalian pastor, given to my revered father when, more than a hundred years ago, he was about to leave his kindred for this Western world, which reads thus: "And may the God of your fathers go with and bless you, and make you a blessing in the New World;

and may you never forget that their name has a good sound here (*einen guten Klang*) in Westphalia. Honorable and true before man, devout and humble before God, earnest and devotedly attached to the Reformed Church, in which the whole family of your ancestors seem to have been conspicuous without bringing reproach upon their name,—follow such examples, and let the name of your fathers not be dishonored in the *Abendland*, but may children's children rise up and bless it. Be true to your country, be true to the pure faith of your Church *in head, heart, and life*, and you will be true to *your adopted country and your God!*"

By God's grace I have, though very, very imperfectly, followed this pious counsel given to my parent and through him to me. I love my Church, her pure martyr-faith and her worship. This Church is dear to me as the apple of my eye. My labors and toils in my better years have been cheerfully given to her. I have made no "sacrifices" worth speaking of; I can boast of no great talents or learning; I have performed no great deeds. And yet she has honored me in many ways, and in the forty-nine years of my imperfectly performed ministerial service I have shared as much—nay, more—of the good will, the love and respect of my ministerial brethren and the membership at large,

as any man ought to desire. I have, therefore, no ends to seek—no dissatisfied feelings which might incite me to oppose any portion of my brethren on personal grounds. This has been alleged against others, although, I must say, very unjustly, so far as I can see. Certainly it is not so in my case. The Church has ever dealt gently with me, and often have I been humbled most deeply by it. She has my undying gratitude and love. I have nothing more to look forward to at my time of life, and I have no desire to be anything else than a private in the ranks, performing quietly such official duties as come to hand. But as I solemnly believe, so have I spoken, not to wound, but, if possible, to heal. My days will soon be numbered; and when the number is full, and my head shall rest upon the death-bed pillow, I am persuaded that the truth which then, as now, will prove a balm and a cordial in my dying hour, will be the truth which, however feebly, I have sought to state and defend in these pages: "That I, with body and soul, am not my own, but belong unto my faithful Saviour Jesus Christ, who WITH HIS PRECIOUS BLOOD HATH FULLY SATISFIED FOR ALL MY SINS." This is my hope, my only trust, my well-grounded assurance. HERE I STAND. I CANNOT OTHERWISE. SO HELP ME GOD. AMEN.

APPENDICES.

APPENDICES.

A.

THE FIRST TEN THOUSAND DOLLAR GIFT IN THE REFORMED CHURCH.

REFERENCE having been made, in the "Letter"* which precedes this volume, to the first ten thousand dollar donation which was given to the institutions of our Church by Mr. Daniel Kieffer, of Berks County, Pennsylvania, it seems a fitting occasion to refer to the circumstances which led to the application, without laying any stress upon them or explaining them, leaving the latter to the psychologist if deemed of sufficient importance.

When the special synod held in Lebanon in the winter of 1843 had unanimously elected the Rev. Dr. F. W. Krummacher as German Professor in the Seminary at Mercersburg, Dr. Hoffeditz and myself were appointed commissioners to convey and more fully to explain the call to that eminent man. There had, however, been no adequate provision made for his support. Ten years before (in 1832) the first professorial endowment of ten thousand dollars had dwindled down, by losses and otherwise, to several thousand dollars less than that amount, which led to my appointment as an agent to make up this deficiency. The plan was to raise it by fifty-dollar subscriptions, which was at that time thought to be a very respectable and rather unusual sum. Coming to the well-to-do rural charge of my friend, the Rev. J. C. Bucher, in Middletown Valley, Maryland, that noble people responded so generously, under the leadership of their zealous pastor, that the amount needed was made up before I had canvassed one-half of the pastorate. Full of the idea that we ought to have another professorship endowed, and that that should be a German one, I took the responsibility, before I had time to receive any official sanction, to commence the raising of funds for a *German* professorship, for which, if I remember rightly, nearly two thousand dollars more were raised in that vicinity, which, as I was then providentially interrupted in my agency, was prosecuted by another for a short time, adding a thousand or two more to the subscription.

This, therefore, was all the provision which had been made for a

* The reference here alluded to is omitted in the Letter, to save space.

German professorship; and even this amount, thus subscribed and collected, had, no doubt from dire necessity (for those were times when funds were generally low in our church treasuries), been diverted to other uses. At the special synod referred to, this state of unpreparedness to support such a man as Krummacher was referred to; but there were brethren who were so zealous to have the author of "Elisha the Tishbite" among us, that they gave assurances of an overflowing treasury in thirty days' time. It was tacitly understood that, as an earnest, ten thousand should be pledged before the commissioners left for Germany.

The commissioners had fixed to meet on the first of April, in Philadelphia, and there they were to hear from the brethren who were so ardent in Lebanon, of the success of the pledges given. But Dr. Hoffeditz, it was found after several days of anxious waiting, could not leave home for a month. Nor was there a single response from any one in regard to the ten thousand dollars. That night was an anxious, sleepless night under a dear brother's roof. Now the thought came to my mind to single out ten brethren who, with myself included, should each give or raise one thousand dollars within thirty days. But this seemed a doubtful measure. Then there came "airy castles" one after another, only to vanish again. At last I laid hold of a remark which the Rev. J. C. Guldin once had made to me: "Some time when you go to your native place, Reading, go to see Daniel Kieffer, in Oley (about eight miles away). He is a pious man, unmarried, is blessed with earthly means, lives very plainly, but I think you could obtain perhaps a handsome donation for the Church from him. He gets your paper, esteems you," etc.

But I had never seen him, and the fact that he was a plain farmer in Berks County seemed not to promise very much. But the thought, though once and again suppressed, would return again,—Go and see him. I so resolved. But the morning light soon dispelled the waking vision of the night. Instead of going to Reading, I went directly homeward to spend the night with my good friend, Judge Bucher, at Harrisburg. My dolorous plaint was confided to his ears—schemes and all. "I will be one of the ten," he promptly replied; "but suppose you first follow out your rejected idea of seeing Mr. Kieffer." But I had lost all heart for it by this time. In the morning, at table, he related, in presence of his family, my distressed state of mind, and that I was fully resolved not to set sail for Europe unless the sum named was guaranteed. All joined in urging me to go to Reading. At last I brought forward the expense of a doubtful journey, whilst yet there was within me a faint lingering hope of possible success. After some time, the Judge remarked, "There is the stage at the door which I have ordered, and the fare to Reading is paid—and you will go." I was really glad of it, as things now came in this shape. Dr. Bucher was then the pastor in that city, who at once favored the visit. We drove to the unassuming farm-house, were cordially received, and in the evening opened up the case to our friend. It came as a surprise to the good man that we should wish so large a sum from one individual. But the case was a plain one, and Dr. Bucher knows well how to state such a case, for he was the Apollo of the occasion, and we left him to

think over it during the night. Early in the morning we found him attending to his farm duties, and met him near the house. Dr. Bucher inquired at once whether he had made up his mind on the subject; to which, with an earnest look, he replied, "I have prayed over the matter, dear brethren, and by God's blessing I will do what you have asked of me."

And so he did, although, through the intervention of certain meddlesome parties, the good man was led to withhold the gift for a time. But, through the considerate and prudent measures of Dr. Bucher, it all came right in the end. And thus was the first donation of ten thousand dollars obtained in the Reformed Church, and thus was a plain farmer of Berks County the instrument of founding the German (or second) professorship, which it is hoped will some day be occupied, as it was intended it should be, by a professor who will give instruction in the Seminary in that language. This statement I have thought due to the memory of the man who gave his money for a "German Professorship."

B.

WHAT THE NEW THEORY CLAIMS TO HOLD.

As a further proof that Dr. Nevin and his school do not pretend to hold the accepted and universally received doctrines of the Reformed Church, or even the generally received truths of Protestantism, we subjoin the following, out of many other declarations. Let the reader say what we are to think of those who over and over again tell us that the new theories "imply no change in Reformed doctrine and worship." To Dr. Nevin must, at least, be accorded the merit of speaking honestly and without reserve. We shall not say more in regard to these extracts, but throw in a few remarks of our own, in brackets.

"With all our respect for the sixteenth century, there is no reason why we should be bound slavishly by all its opinions and judgments [not at all, only that as *Reformed* we have no right, *so long as we are in that Church*, to cast its "opinions and judgments" overboard]; no reason why we should not see and acknowledge its defects, where they may appear plainly to exist." [Appear to exist for *whom?* Shall every man's private judgment pit itself against the Church, as, for instance, Rationalism did in Germany in the last century, changing the hymn-books, catechisms, etc., to suit "the wants of the enlightened age"?] —*Nevin's Liturg. Quest.*, p. 40.

"The conflict in the case, as already said, is a conflict of theological systems; . . . a controversy about doctrines and articles of faith, that strikes far beyond the German Reformed Church, *into the life of the*

entire Protestantism of this land" [*doctrines* and *articles of faith*,—mark this,—and not merely those of our own Reformed Church, but *all Protestantism*].—*Nevin's Vind.*, p. 80.

"It is to be freely admitted, moreover, that there lay in the distinguishing spirit of the Reformed Confession, as such, from the beginning, a tendency in opposition to the constraint of fixed religious rites and ceremonies, which could hardly fail to exert an injurious influence on any work of this sort. It belongs, as we all know, to the Reformed Church, to represent that side of the Christian life in which the *inward*, the *free*, the *spiritual*, in religion, are asserted against the authority of the merely outward in every view. Such is her historical vocation; such is her genius."—*The Liturg. Quest.*, p. 41. [True, every word of it. The Reformed Church (more than the Lutheran) was ever decidedly opposed to the trammels of "fixed religious rites and ceremonies." She emphasized rather that side which is practical and "subjective" (so called). That *was* and *is* her genius—that her "historical vocation." Why shall it now, therefore, be ignored and cast out as vile and *anathema?*]

"The idea of a resuscitated theology, then, in our circumstances, requires something more than a simple return to the theology either of the seventeenth or sixteenth century."—*Nevin, Merc. Rev.*, July, 1868, p. 360. [But does it require us to go back to the time when priests, bishops, and popes scandalized religion and morality (according to their own historians) and resuscitate our theology from *that* period?]

"But this is just what *repristination* means here, whether on the Lutheran side or on the Reformed side. Let it be *anathema maranatha*, then, we say, on both sides."—*Merc. Rev.*, p. 363. [An inspired Apostle pronounced the LORD'S anathema—upon whom? Upon those who hated, *i.e.*, did not love, the Lord Jesus Christ. Is it competent for any mortal man now to hurl that curse against those who do sincerely aim to love and honor the Lord Jesus, although they may not be willing to cast away the birthright of the Reformation? We do not hold to a blind fettering of the spirit to every formulated dogma, as such, as this may have been held in the sixteenth or seventeenth century. But as to the essential truths of that period, no unhallowed rude hand may violently tear them asunder, in the style of the pope.]

"This theology [the Mercersburg] has never professed to be of the *same type* with that around it."—*Merc. Rev.*, July, 1867, p. 383.

"Our Christological theology is distinctive. *Let all understand this fully and finally*, and then save themselves the useless pains of measuring it by their own."—p. 383. [This is fully understood. We know of no Protestant, or, for that matter, any *other* theology, that is just like it. It is a new type, but, as with wine, we think the old is better than the new.]

"Thus it is *to the honor of our theology* that on the one hand *it is charged with a backward tendency towards Rome*, and on the other hand *it is characterized as a bold and free movement forward beyond the traditionary bounds of all that is called orthodoxy* in Protestantism."—p. 400.

[This, again, is both true and honest. The charge that this new

theory is "a backward tendency towards Rome" is thus not only acknowledged, but is deemed an honor. And so, on the other hand, it is acknowledged to be "a bold and free movement beyond all that is called orthodoxy in Protestantism." Let us, then, have no more denial on this point by the disciples of the new theory. The master is above the disciple.]

"Our opponents, comprising four-fifths, if not nine-tenths, of the ministry and laity belonging to the Reformed family of Churches, answer in the negative, and maintain that the doctrine of baptismal regeneration is neither Reformed nor Protestant, but Romish."—*Merc. Rev.*, April, 1868, p. 182.

"If it be so that Protestantism shall stand the test in the arbitrament of God in history, as being substantially the main bearer of the Christian life, it is plain that it cannot do so *on the sole basis on which it started*, or on the basis of what it has since been *or now is, but alone on the basis of what it has the power of yet becoming*."—p. 394. [*On the sole basis on which it started*, Protestantism cannot stand the test, so Dr. Nevin thinks. It is plain, therefore, that he has no faith in it as it now stands, "but alone on the basis of what it has the power of *yet becoming*." We must therefore still wait to see what "the things be that are yet to come." All is yet a sandy bottom—all uncertainty; no realizing conviction of the passage in Hebrews, xiii. 9, especially after the German rendering: *Es ist ein köstlich Ding dass das Herz fest werde*. Is it any wonder, then, when young men are taught that Protestantism, on the basis on which it started and on which it has since been or now is, is untenable, and that we must therefore look elsewhere,—is it any wonder, after teaching them that they must go *backward* (back of the Reformation)—back to the middle ages, and then "forward beyond the traditionary bounds of all that is called orthodoxy in Protestantism,"—is it any wonder, we ask, that young men so taught should not lose faith in Protestantism? and what more natural than to catch at the straw of Infallibility which the Romish Church throws out to them? You first remove from under their feet the *foundation*, and then say to them, "But don't you catch at the straw; by-and-by we will perhaps discover some safe boat for us and you!" That is miserable comfort, we should say.]

(Appendix G contains some further statements on this subject.)

Whilst penning the foregoing sentences, we were led to refer to the recent work of that eminently great and good man, who is acknowledged to have written the ablest work on Systematic Theology in America,—we mean Dr. Charles Hodge, of Princeton.* We append a few extracts on the philosophical and theological aspects of the new theory now under consideration, which will show how they strike such a man as Dr. Hodge; a man who shows, in this learned work, that the speculations of ancient and modern times are well understood by him. And so also are *our* new theories.

---

* Systematic Theology. By Charles Hodge, D.D., New York, 1873, vol. iii.

REGENERATION.

MODERN SPECULATIVE VIEWS ON THIS SUBJECT.

After saying that modern speculative philosophy had introduced such a radical change in the views entertained of the nature of God, His relation to the world, of the person and work of Christ, and of the application of His redemption for the salvation of men, that one might safely say that the ancient and Scriptural forms of these doctrines were superseded, and others introduced which could not be understood unless one understood their philosophy, and that this brings down the truths of the Bible to the form of philosophical dogmas, Dr. Hodge says:

"We cease to hear of the Holy Ghost, as the third person of the Trinity, applying to men the redemption purchased by Christ. . . . They teach, First, that there is no dualism in man between soul and body. There is but one life. The body is the soul projecting itself externally. Without a body there is no soul. Second, that there is no real dualism between God and man. The identity between God and man is the last result of modern speculation; and it is the fundamental idea of Christianity. . . . These attempts have resulted, in some instances, in avowed Christian Pantheism, as it is called; in others, in forms of doctrine so nearly pantheistic as to be hardly distinguished from Pantheism itself; and in all, in a radical modification, not only of the theology of the Church as expressed in her received standards, but also of the Scriptural form of Christian doctrines, if not of their essence. . . . There is no dualism in Christ as between soul and body. Neither is there any dualism between Divinity and humanity in Him. *The Divine and human in His person are one life.* In being the ideal or perfect man, He is the true God. The deification which humanity reached in Christ is not a supernatural act on the part of God; *it is reached by a natural process of development in His people*, that is, *the Church.** *The soteriology* [the doctrine of salvation by Christ] of this system is simple. The soul projects itself in the body. They are one life, but the body may be too much for the soul. . . . So humanity as a *generic life*, a form of the life of God, as projected externally in the world from Adam onward, has not developed itself aright. If left unaided, it would not reach the goal, or unfold itself as Divine. A new start, therefore, must be given to it, a new commencement made. This is done by a supernatural intervention resulting in the production of the *person of Christ.* In Him Divinity assumes the fashion of a man—the existence-form of man; God becomes man, and man is God. This renewed entrance, so to speak, of God into the world, this special form of *Divine-human life, is Christianity*, which is constantly declared to be 'a life,' 'the life of Christ,'†

---

* The italicizing is our own, here and onward.

† [A plain but pious and well-read member of our Church said to me some years ago, "For a whole year I listened to the sermons of our new pastor, and heard him

'a new theanthropic life.' Men become Christians by being partakers of this life, . . . by union with the Church and reception of the sacraments.* The incarnation of God is continued in the Church [is 'perennial']; and this principle of 'Divine-human life' descends from Christ to the members of the Church, *as naturally* and as much by a *process of organic development, as humanity derived from Adam unfolded itself in his descendants.* Christ, therefore, saves us, not so much by what He did [His sufferings and death, for instance], as by what He *is*. He made no satisfaction to the Divine justice; no expiation for sin. . . . There is, therefore, no justification, no real pardon even, in the ordinary sense of the word. . . . Those who become partakers of this new principle of life, which is truly human and truly Divine, become one with Christ. All the merit, righteousness, excellence, etc., are our own. They are subjective in us and form our character, just as the nature derived from Adam was ours, with all its corruptions and infirmities.

"If asked what is regeneration according to this system, the proper answer would probably be, that it is an obsolete term. There is no room for the thing usually signified by the word, and no reason for retaining the word itself. Regeneration is a work of the Holy Spirit as a distinct person or agent. But this system in its integrity does not acknowledge the Holy Spirit as a distinct person or agent. And those who are constrained to make the acknowledgment of His personality are evidently embarrassed by the admission. What the Scriptures and the Church ascribe to the Spirit working with the freedom of a personal agent when and where He sees fit, this system attributes to the 'theanthropic life' of Christ, working as a new force, according to the natural laws of development.†

"The impression made upon the readers of the modern theologians of this school is that made by any other form of philosophical disquisition. It has not, and from its nature it cannot have, anything more than human authority. This system may be adopted as a matter of opinion, but it cannot be an object of faith; and, therefore, it cannot support

---

going over the expressions, 'Christianity is not doctrine, not this and not that, but *life*;' and I still thought he meant by that, that we must show our faith by a godly life. And yet he never said a word about repentance, faith, or things of that sort. So I once asked him about it, when he smiled at my ignorance and tried to explain what it *did* mean. But for the life of me I could not understand what it was, but I thought of 1 Timothy vi. 20."—S.]

* [To corroborate and intensify the correctness of this delineation of the teachings of the new theory as here given by Dr. Hodge, we annex the following two sentences from an article on (Baptismal) Regeneration in the *Mercersburg Review* for January, 1873, by the Rev. W. Rupp, and defended by our Lancaster professors. Speaking of regeneration, he says, "That life-breath which God breathed into Adam, when he became a living soul, cannot be regarded otherwise than as an emanation from the being of God." And then, further on: "In like manner the life of regeneration is an emanation, by the Holy Ghost, from Christ's Divine-human life, and yet no sensible or material part of His personal being."

The critical reader will please mark the expression "emanation" (twice repeated), as appertaining to the out-and-out pantheistic school. Yet Mr. Rupp *may* be unwilling to be understood in so bad a sense. But in that case a scientific statement ought to be made in strictly scientific form. It certainly both looks and sounds strange, to speak mildly.—S.]

† Mystical Presence (by Dr. Nevin), pp. 225–29.

the hopes of a soul conscious of guilt. In turning from such writings to the word of God, the transition, these theologians would have us believe, is from γνῶσις to πίστις [from *knowledge* to *faith*]; but to the consciousness of the Christian it is like the transition from the confusion of tongues at Babel, where no man understood his fellow, to the symphonious utterance of those 'who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.'"—pp. 18–22.

Referring to those who deny the Scriptural doctrine of the relation of God to the world, everything being according to law, ordered, and uniform, the same author says:

"Those who depart from their principles so far as to admit the person of Christ to be supernatural in its origin, contend that the supernatural in Him becomes natural, and that from Him onward the diffusion of spiritual life is by a regular process of development, as simply natural as the development of humanity from Adam through all his posterity. *This is a purely philosophical theory.* It has no authority for Christians. As it is contrary to the express teaching of the Scriptures, it cannot be adopted by those who recognize them as the infallible rule of faith and practice. As it contradicts the moral and religious convictions arising from the constitution of our nature, it must be hurtful in all its tendencies, and can be adopted by those only who sacrifice to speculation their interior life."—p. 37.

C.

JUSTIFICATION AND SANCTIFICATION.

An eminent writer says on this subject:

"Justification and sanctification should always be discriminated, but they must never be disunited. Where they are not distinguished, a religious system cannot be clear; and where they are divided, it can never be safe. Where they are not distinguished, law and gospel, free will and free grace, the merit of man and the righteousness of Christ, run into a mass of confusion and disorder. And where they are divided, Pharisaical pride and antinomian presumption will be sure to follow. Be it remembered, then, that the one regards something done *for* us, the other something done *in* us. The one is a relative (change of our relation to God), the other a personal change. The one is perfect at once (justification), the other (sanctification) is gradual. The one is derived from the obedience of the Saviour, the other from His Spirit. The one gives us a title to heaven, the other a meetness (fitness) for it."

The venerable Dr. A. Alexander, of Princeton, said on his death-bed, "All my theology is reduced to the prayer of the publican: God be merciful to me a sinner!"

John Wesley said on his death-bed to one who referred to the long and successful labors of his (Wesley's) life and labors, "I see nothing in aught I have done that can be a ground of hope or assurance to me but this:

'I the chief of sinners am,
But Jesus died for me!'"

And that was enough. May it be your heart-felt confession, dear reader, and mine!

D.

NO HUMAN CONFESSORS.

THE devoted Canon Ryle, a dignitary of the Church of England, and, if we mistake not, one of the chaplains of Queen Victoria, in one of his tracts on the present disturbed state of the Church in that country on account of the gradual introduction of Romish ceremonies, uses the following solemn words on the effort to revive the Confessional:

"We honor the minister's office highly, but we refuse to give it a hair's breadth more dignity than we find given it in the word of God. We honor ministers as Christ's ambassadors, Christ's messengers, Christ's watchmen, helpers of believers' joys, preachers of the word, and stewards of the mysteries of God. But we decline to regard them as priests, mediators, confessors, and rulers over men's faith, both for the sake of their souls and our own.

"Listen not to those who tell you that evangelical teaching is opposed to the exercise of discipline, or heart-examination, or mortification of the flesh, or true contrition. Opposed to it! There never was a more baseless assertion. We are entirely favorable to it. This only we require, that it shall be carried on in the right way. We approve of a Confessional, but it must be the only true one, the Throne of Grace. We approve of going to a confessor, but it must be to the true one, Christ the Lord. We approve of submitting consciences to a priest, but it must be to the great High Priest, Jesus the Son of God. We approve of unbosoming our secret sins and seeking absolution, but it must be at the feet of the great Head of the Church, and not at the feet of one of His weak members. We approve of kneeling to receive ghostly counsel, but it must be at the feet of Christ, and not at the feet of man.

"Reader, beware of ever losing sight of Christ's priestly office. Glory in His atoning death. Honor Him as your substitute and surety on the Cross. Follow Him as your Shepherd. Hear His voice as your Prophet. Obey Him as your King. But in all your thoughts about Christ, let it be often before your mind, that He alone is your High Priest, and that He has deputed His priestly office to no order of men in the world. This is the office of Christ which Satan labors above all to obscure. It is the neglect of this office which leads to every

kind of error. It is the remembrance of this which is the best safeguard against the plausible teaching of the Church of Rome. *Once right about this office, you will never greatly err in the matter of the confession of sin. You will know to whom confession ought to be made; and to know that rightly is no slight thing.*"

THE CROSS OF CHRIST THE BELIEVER'S JOY.

"A few years since, a drawing representing the crucified Saviour was found upon the walls of the ancient palace of the Cæsars in Rome. The rude sketch speaks to us from the midst of the times of the struggle between Christianity and heathenism, and is a memorial of the manner in which the minds of men were then stirred. Some heathen servant of the emperor is taunting his Christian fellow-servant with this contemptuous sign. The relic belongs to about the year A.D. 200, and is by far the most ancient crucifix we know of. But this, the oldest crucifix, is an ironical one. It is a caricature of Christ, before which a Christian stands worshiping, and it bears the inscription, 'Alexamenos (the name of the derided Christian) worshiping his God.' We see that the crucified Saviour and the preaching of the Cross were the scorn of the world. In the great struggle between heathenism and Christianity, the Cross was the sign of victory. . . . If Christianity is to conquer the world, it will only do so as the preaching of the Cross, and not by concessions to the natural reason. . . . If we would truly understand God, we must make the Cross our starting-point, for it is here that His holiness and His love are found united. If we would have communion with God, we must seek it at the Cross, for it is here that judgment is executed on the sin which separates us from God, and here that the love is manifested which unites us with Him. So long, therefore, as there are Christians on earth,—and that will be to the end of time,—their confession will be, 'He who died upon the Cross is my Beloved.'"—*Luthardt.*

"O sacred Head, now wounded,
With grief and shame weighed down,
Now scornfully surrounded
With thorns, Thine only crown,—
O sacred Head, what glory,
What bliss, till now was Thine!
Yet, though despised and gory,
I joy to call Thee mine."—

(Paul Gerhardt: translated by Dr. James W. Alexander.)

E.

Dr. Luthardt says, "He [God] has His work in the souls of children as well as in the souls of adults. Yet we grant that this communion with God must become a matter of consciousness [experience]. And it is for this reason that we follow Baptism by Confirmation,—*not to complete Baptism*, for it is complete already; not to renew it, for it is a beginning once for all; but that the baptized may express, with his own mouth, that confession of faith upon which he was baptized, that his covenant with God in Baptism may be the covenant of his conscious choice, and that he may receive the blessing at the very time of his moral development and his moral danger. With Confirmation we combine the first reception of the Lord's Supper, and consequently full membership in the Christian Church." (Lecture ix. pp. 241–2.)

F.

[The following theses on the ministerial office were proposed by the eminent Court preacher and councillor of the High Consistory, Dr. Schwartz, of Saxony, before a convention of ministers, several years ago, and by them were adopted. It is seldom that we see so much valuable matter compressed into so few words. We ask a careful study of this able statement.]

THE OFFICE OF THE EVANGELICAL MINISTRY IN ITS RELATION TO THE CHURCH.

1. The office of the ministry exists not for its own sake, neither outside, nor before, nor over the Church; but it grows out of her, stands in her, and labors with her, as the central point of the organized Church.

2. It does not operate in a saving way by the power of an institution, but alone through a living and working (*werkthätigen*) faith of the office-bearer.

3. It is not founded, nevertheless designed (*gewollt*) by God, proceeds not immediately but mediately, not in a supernatural but in a natural way, from Him, and is in no other sense of Divine origin than as every higher organization from an inward necessity is such,—as is the office of teaching and governing.

4. It is not founded by Christ, although designed by Him, as He specially called only the Apostles, furnished with His Spirit, merely *founding* the Kingdom of God, but not *organizing* the Church.

5. It is exercised by the commission and authority of the Church, but is not on that account dependent upon the variable views and

wishes of the many, but rather under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, who is the only Lord of the Church, and who leads her into all Truth.

6. The idea of the Universal Priesthood, as it was again revived by Luther (and other Reformers), contains the truth, that the office of the ministry does not rest upon a difference of the quality, but only upon a distribution of labor, or, that there is not a special class (*Stand*), but only a spiritual calling (*Beruf*).

7. The ministerial office includes, as its necessary prerequisites, these three things: (*a*) an inward call or a spiritual fitness; (*b*) the preparation or education for it; (*c*) the external call or appointment.

8. The inward call, although in different degrees, belongs to all the members of the Church, and is the foundation of the Universal Priesthood; the education and external call belong only to a part, and are the basis of the regular office.

9. Fanatics and sectarians disregard education and an outward call; State theologians and hierarchists disregard the gifts of the Spirit.

10. The ministerial office is an office of the Spirit, and therefore is effective only in a spiritual—that is to say, in a real and free—way, not by outward constraint or coercion.

11. There is a pastoral office, not merely an office of preaching, but one in deed, consisting not merely in proclaiming the gospel, but also in leading the congregation by an exemplary evangelical life.

12. The sermon, the administration of the sacraments, and the office of the Keys (the exercise of Christian discipline), are only different methods and applications in preaching the gospel.

THE CHURCH IN THE OLD AND IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The Church historian Dr. A. Neander, in his preface to a book by the Rev. Mr. Coleman (August, 1843), says:

"It is of the utmost importance to keep ever in view the difference between the economy of the Old Testament and that of the New. The neglect of this has given rise to the grossest errors, and to divisions, by which those who ought to be united together in the bonds of Christian love have been sundered from each other. In the Old Testament, everything relating to the Kingdom of God was estimated by *outward forms* and promoted by specific *external rites*. In the New, everything is made to depend upon what is *internal* and *spiritual*. Other foundation, as the Apostle Paul has said, can no man lay than is laid. Upon this the Christian Church at first was grounded, and upon this alone, in all time to come, must it be reared anew and compacted together. Faith in Jesus of Nazareth, the Saviour of the world, and union with Him, a participation in that salvation which cometh through Him,—this is that inward principle, that unchangeable foundation, on which the Christian Church essentially rests. But whenever, instead of making the existence of the Church to depend on this inward principle alone, the necessity of some outward form is asserted as an indispensable means of grace, we readily perceive that the purity of its char-

acter is impaired. The spirit of the Old Testament is commingled with that of the New."

Dr. Neander, in the same preface, says: "When, however, the doctrine is (as it gradually gained currency in the third century) that the bishops are by Divine right the head of the Church, and invested with the government of the same; that they are the successors of the Apostles, and by this succession inherit apostolical authority; that they are the medium through which, in consequence of that ordination which they have received merely in an outward manner, the Holy Ghost in all time to come must be transmitted to the Church,—when this becomes the doctrine of the Church, we certainly must perceive in these assumptions a strong corruption of the purity of the Christian system. *It is a carnal perversion of the true idea of the Christian Church.* It is falling back into the spirit of the Jewish religion. Instead of the Christian idea of a Church based on inward principles of communion, and extending itself by means of these, it presents us with the image of one, like that under the Old Testament, resting in outward ordinances, and by external rites seeking to promote the propagation of the Kingdom of God. This entire perversion of the original view of the Christian Church was itself the origin of the whole system of the Roman Catholic religion,—the germ from which sprang the popery of the dark ages."

G.

HOW THE NEW THEORY HAS LED TO ROME.

A FRIEND at a distance has sent us the following extract from a letter from one of the Reformed ministers who, under the influence of Mercersburg teaching, have been landed in the Roman Church, which strongly confirms and illustrates our position referred to in its proper place, and hence it is proper and right to give it a place here. He says:

"The report on the state of religion at the Synod of Danville was adopted nem. con. (Dr. Nevin being reported . . . to have called it a 'glorious' report). . . . The *Messenger* unwittingly speaks one true word in reference to certain 'perverts' giving up the active duties of the ministry, or laboring in it with only half a heart. The reason was that *Mercersburg cut the sinews of their strength* by destroying their faith in Protestantism. So it was with —— and myself. So it was with —— and —— and others. . . . —— used to say (and others repeated it), '*Dr. Nevin has hamstrung his horses, and then says to them, Now, horses, go and work!*'"

We regard this testimony from one of the "perverts" as important and significant. It is the same that was given to us by one of them twenty years ago, and it opens to us a view of the process by which their minds were led away from the faith of their fathers into the dismal and dreary notions of Romanism. We can see, too, that this description

is true. It was a *legitimate* effect of the system we have been trying to lay open to the public gaze of the Church. The childish outcry that this is testimony from men who are now Roman Catholics, won't do. They were on their way thither for a long time, and when some of us said so it was cried down as slander. They carried the seeds in them for years, and they merely say now what they always did, that they were taught in a way that made them dissatisfied with Protestantism. That is the truth in a nutshell, and it cannot be successfully gainsaid.

"Irenæus," in the *Messenger* of October 8, 1873, says that the opposition to "Nevinism" was as much in fault in leading some of our ministers to Rome as was the "Mercersburg-Lancaster School;" and he argues more truthfully, but for his cause not more wisely, than some others. His argument is, that if those who were "afflicted by a Romanizing *mania* had been allowed quietly to go on without opposition, they would have remained in the Church; but, finding powerful opposing elements at work which might put an end to that 'mania,' they preferred to depart." Just so. Allow the men to go on "developing" their "Romanizing mania" at pleasure, as the Puseyites in England are doing (and "Irenæus" says Puseyism is a "parallel" to "Nevinism"), and the Reformed Church, with a comfortable support, will be good enough for them. Why should they leave the Reformed Church if she is weak and good-natured enough to allow those smitten with the "Romanizing mania" to eat her bread, and, besides that, to browbeat and smite her children because they will not take the infection of the Pontine marshes near the Tiber? The reasoning is well taken; but a shrewder man would not have "taken" it.

II.

EXEGETICAL NOTES ON THE GOSPEL OF JOHN.

BY DR. SCHAFF, IN LANGE'S COMMENTARY.*

THE readers of these pages will, we are sure, thank us for the following well-matured and instructive notes on various important passages from the pen of Dr. Schaff. No one, probably, is better qualified than he to appreciate the new theory which we regard as erroneous, and which these expositions, without any apparent aim or design, nullify or disprove. We avail ourselves, in part, of the judicious grouping of these extracts by the Rev. Dr. Bomberger, in his *Reformed*

---

* The Gospel according to John. By John Peter Lange, D.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Bonn (Prussia). Translated from the German, revised, enlarged, and edited, by Ph. Schaff, D.D., Professor of Theology in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. 1871; Scribner & Co.; royal 8vo, pp. 654. We consider the volume of Lange's Commentary on John, and that on Matthew, the most valuable of all the New Testament volumes as far as published.

Church Monthly for 1871, together with some remarks from his own pen.

"The distinctive characteristics of the Gospel of John," says Dr. Bomberger, "invest it with special interest and importance for some of the leading points of theological discussion or controversy in our day. It is to this Gospel, mainly, that the advocates of *theanthropism* appeal, as if confident that it furnishes full support to their theory of an *immanent organic* union of the Godhead with humanity. So, too, when they claim that Christ and the Church are so substantially one, that the Church is but Christ perpetuating His own personal life through the Church in the world, and so redeeming the race, they mainly rely on John for proof. Here, too, they think they find the strongest justification of their peculiar sacramental views, baptismal regeneration, and the real communication of the substance of Christ's glorified humanity in and through the Holy Supper. And no one can deny that there are detached passages in this Gospel which may, in sound at least, *seem* to favor these and other similar ultra false church views.

"As it is by John that the Spirit reveals more fully than in either of the other Gospels the mysterious tri-personality of the glorious Godhead, so it is here we find set forth, in the most explicit terms, the vital relation of believers to God in Christ. This is naturally and necessarily done in figurative language; hence the temptation for minds of a speculative mystic turn to misapprehend and misinterpret what is said, and to let themselves be led, by their own error, into pantheistic mists. The Gospel is not a fault. It presents the truth plainly enough to prevent such false conceptions of the matter. Those falling under the power of such conceptions are betrayed by their own deceptive philosophy and indulged theosophic dreams.

"All this, however, adds greatly to the interest as well as responsibility of the expositor's work. And any one duly competent for the sacred task, not only by his learning, but still more by his being in true spiritual harmony with the spirit of John, and especially of Him on whose inmost bosom the beloved disciple so confidingly reposed—any one so fitted for the work could not fail to find the work as congenial as it is solemn.

"This Gospel affords such a commentator abundant opportunities for exposing and correcting some of the most specious and ensnaring errors by which the truth has ever been perverted, as well as for clearly exhibiting and defending the most vital doctrines of Christianity. It thus becomes at once a severe test of his own evangelical orthodoxy regarding fundamental articles of faith. And in proportion to his fidelity to that faith in the performance of his task, will he be sure to receive the warm approval of all who love it, and to draw down upon himself the censure and condemnation of those who have departed from it.

"Dr. Schaff has clearly felt this, and more deeply, no doubt, than we can tell it, in the preparation of the volume before us. He proves it by the labor so cheerfully bestowed upon the work in large voluntary additions to the original. He knew the special demands of the theological latitude in which it would circulate. Circumstances had made

him more familiar than, probably, any other American theologian, with speculations of the most perilous character. These, though as yet confined to very narrow limits of influence, might, by their novelty and speciousness and 'show of wisdom,' spread with mischievous power among unsuspecting but novelty-loving disciples of theology. Hence the American editor felt called by duty freely to enlarge upon Dr. Lange's comments by numerous notes. These notes are critical, exegetical, and doctrinal, and add greatly, for us at least, to the value of the German work.

"The added doctrinal notes have special significance, as some of the fullest of them touch upon important questions now at issue among us. We can cite only a few of them. But they will suffice to show our readers both what we mean, and why we set so much store by them.

"*First*, on the relation of God in Christ to creation and the world, Dr. Schaff declares:

"'The Scripture doctrine of creation differs: 1, from Pantheism, which teaches an eternal world, and confounds God with the world; 2, from Dualism, or the eternity of matter antagonistic to God; 3, from *the emanation theory*;* 4, from Deism, which asserts the creation but separates it from the Creator; 5, from Materialism, which makes matter the mother of the spirit and is alike degrading to God and man' (p. 63 of Comm.).

"The first and third points in the above quotation merit special thought. We have italicized the third, which the editor does not define, and added in the foot-note what we regard as its true import.

"*Secondly*, on the Incarnation, it is gratifying to hear Dr. S. affirm so distinctly:

"'The Logos assumed, not an individual man or a single human *personality*, but human nature (of course *this* individually,—B.), *into union with His pre-existent Divine personality*. . . . It is not the flesh as opposed to the *spirit*, that is here ("the Word became flesh"), but human nature *as distinct from the Divine*. . . . The term ("only-begotten," chapter i. 14) refers back to v. 12, and marks the difference between Christ and the believers. 1, He is the only Son *in a sense in which there is no other;* they are many; 2, He is Son from eternity; they become children in time; 3, He is Son by nature; they *are made sons by grace and adoption;* 4, He is of the same essence with the Father; *they are of a different substance. In other* words, His is a metaphysical primitive and co-essential Sonship, *theirs only an ethical and derived Sonship.*'

"In the passages we have italicized above, it must be cheering to all evangelical readers to note how distinctly Dr. S. reiterates the old faith, and repudiates all thought of such an organic conjunction of the eternal Word with humanity as involves a perpetual transmission of *the substance of the life* of the Word incarnate to the race regenerated by such transmission.

"*Thirdly*, In the third chapter of the Gospel, which contains the con-

* "Which teaches that all life is but a flowing forth of the substance of the life of God into things so created and an essential part of that Divine life, by an organic process.—B."

versation of our Lord with Nicodemus, Dr. Schaff finds a fitting opportunity to affirm and vindicate the old evangelical doctrine concerning Baptism, and he faithfully improves the opportunity. After remarking that 'true religion in the soul *begins with a personal conviction of sin and guilt*, . . . without which all efforts to convert a man are in vain,' he adds:

"'It is characteristic of the idealism and mysticism of John that in his Gospel he gives no account of the institution of the Church and the sacraments. But, anticipating the visible rite, he presents in ch. 3 the idea of the new birth which is *symbolized in Christian Baptism*, together with the idea of "the kingdom of God" which is the internal and abiding essence of the Church. So in ch. 6 he gives the general idea of vital union with Christ, which underlies the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.'

"*Baptism and Regeneration.* These, in their relation to each other, receive earnest consideration under ch. 3. Dr. Schaff's notes upon them are full and explicit. And they were evidently written, *not hastily*, as Dr. Apple of Mercersburg says, but with careful thought. This will be evident from the following quotations:

"'Regeneration is a *creative act* of God the Holy Spirit, whereby a new spiritual life from above is implanted in man, through the means of grace, *especially the* preaching of the gospel; like the natural birth, it can occur but once. . . . As to its origin and mode of operation, it is a mystery, like the natural generation and birth, but a mystery manifest in its effects to all who have spiritual eyes to see; it meets us as a fact in every true Christian or child of God, who is as sure of the higher life of Christ in his own soul as he is of his natural existence.' In another view of the subject, yet one in entire harmony with the foregoing passage, he speaks of regeneration as 'a moral new birth.'

"Having thus defined the true idea of regeneration, the doctrine of baptism itself receives attention in a note under verse 5,—'born of water and the Spirit,' etc. Dr. S. says, 'The key to the sense of the passage is furnished by the declaration of the Baptist that he baptized only with water, but Christ would baptize with the Holy Ghost (i. 33), and by the passage of Paul where he connects Christian baptism as "the bath of regeneration" with the renewal of the Holy Ghost, *and yet distinguishes both* (Tit. iii. 5).' Other illustrative passages are cited, and the frequent figurative use of the term *water* in the Old Testament referred to. Dr. Schaff then adds:

"'The idea which underlies all these baptisms is essentially the same. We would, therefore, not confine "water" to any particular form of baptism, but (with Lange, see below, No. 5) extend it to all preparatory illustrations; nor would we refer it directly to the sacrament as an external act or rite, but (with Olshausen) to the *idea* rather,—of which the cleansing with water is the symbolic expression,—just as in ch. 6 we have an exposition of the general *idea* of the holy communion before the *sacrament* was instituted in which it comes to its full embodiment. The idea underlying all forms of baptism is the *forgiveness of sins* on condition of repentance. This is the *negative* part of regeneration, while the new life communicated by the Holy Spirit is the *positive* part, or regeneration proper. So Peter, in his pentecostal ser-

mon, represents the matter when he calls upon his hearers, "Repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost" (Acts ii. 38). The chief matter is, of course, the positive part, the gift of the Holy Spirit, who is the efficient cause, the creative and vivifying agent of regeneration, and who alone can make the word and the sacrament effective. Hence the Spirit alone is mentioned in verses 6 and 8. The omission of water here is as significant as the omission of baptism in the negative clause of Mark xvi. 16, where the condition of salvation and the reason of damnation are laid down. This is a sufficient hint that the necessity of water baptism to salvation is not absolute, but relative only. The penitent thief passed into Paradise without water baptism. Cornelius was regenerated before he was baptized, and many martyrs in the early ages died for Christ before they had a chance to receive the sacrament. *It is possible to have the substance without the form, the baptism of the Spirit without the baptism of the water; as it is quite common on the other hand to be baptized with water and have the Christian name without the Christian spirit and life.* The Apostles themselves (except Paul) never received Christian baptism, for Christ Himself, who alone could have administered it to them, did not baptize (iv. 2). In their case the pentecostal effusion of the Spirit was sufficient. We are bound to God's appointed means of grace, but God is free, and the Spirit "bloweth where it listeth." ' In another note he still further emphasizes the vitally important truth brought out so strongly above, by declaring, 'The necessity of regeneration and faith to salvation is absolute, the necessity of baptism or anything else is merely relative. *Only unbelief*, that is, the rejection of the gospel, with or without baptism, condemns.'

"Dr. T. G. Apple, as it were speaking for Mercersburg theology in its latest development, takes Dr. Schaff to task for uttering sentiments like these. He charges Dr. S. with error in exegesis (!) and in theology. Of course, then, by Dr. A.'s confession, Mercersburg holds essentially different views. This we readily believe. Then the simple question is, Which is Reformed doctrine? which is true? The doctrine as so explicitly and frankly avowed in his commentary, *or* the views advocated by Mercersburg? Few readers will probably hesitate, any more than we do, to prefer the old faith to the new.

"*Fourthly.* The Lord's Supper, etc. Under the sixth chapter of the Gospel Dr. Schaff supplies some very valuable notes touching the significance of the Lord's Supper and doctrines connected with it. We reluctantly limit ourselves to a few brief quotations, which, however, will enable the reader to catch the general drift of the comments. As a clear indication of his ruling convictions, Dr. S. remarks, on vi. 29, upon 'the distinction between believing Christ, which is simply an intellectual assent to an historical fact, . . . and believing *in* Christ as an object of confidence and hope, which implies a vital union with Him. This is both a work of Divine grace and the highest work of man. . . . Faith is the greatest act of freedom towards God, for by it He gives Himself, and more man cannot do. . . . Schleiermacher calls this passage the clearest and most significant declaration *that all eternal life proceeds from nothing less than faith in Christ.*'

"Again, on vi. 44: 'The natural inability of man to come to Christ, however, is not physical nor intellectual, but moral and spiritual. It is an unwillingness. *No change of mental organization, no new faculty, is required, but a radical change of the heart and will. This is effected by the Holy Ghost, but the providential drawing of the Father prepares the way for it.*'

"Regarding the sacramental interpretation of vi. 51, etc., Dr. Schaff holds, that whilst the passage does not refer directly to the Lord's Supper, it sets forth the idea of it. He says:

"'*If participation in the Lord's Supper were a necessary pre-requisite of salvation, Christ would undoubtedly have said so when He instituted the ordinance. But throughout the gospel, and especially in this discourse, He makes* FAITH *the only condition* of eternal life. He first exhibits Himself as the Bread of Life, and promises eternal life to every one who eats this bread, *that is, who believes in Him.* He then holds out the same promise to all those who eat His flesh and drink His blood, *which, consequently, must be essentially the same act as believing.* The discourse, therefore, refers to a broader and deeper fact, *which precedes and underlies* the sacrament, and of which the sacrament is a significant sign and seal, viz., *personal union of the believing soul with Christ, and a living appropriation of His atoning sacrifice.* . . . We must distinguish between a *spiritual* manducation of Christ *by faith*, and a *sacramental* manducation; the former alone is essential to everlasting life, and is the proper subject of the discourse. John omits an account of the institution both of baptism and the Lord's Supper, . . . but he gives those profound discourses of Christ which explain the spiritual meaning of the sacraments, namely, the idea of regeneration, which is *signed and sealed* in baptism (ch. 3), and *the idea of personal communion* with Him, which is *celebrated* in the Lord's Supper (ch. 6). This suggests a very important doctrinal inference, viz., that the spiritual reality of regeneration and union with Christ is not so bound to the external sacramental sign that it cannot be enjoyed without that sign. *We* must obey God's ordinances, but *God* is free, and we should bless whom He blesses. High sacramentarianism is contrary to the teaching of Christ, according to St. John.'

"Strongly as we feel tempted to multiply such declarations as these, so fully in harmony with Apostolic teaching and the common faith of Evangelical Christendom, and just as directly opposed to all Popish and Puseyite perversions of the gospel, we must not trespass upon our pages further than to add the following:

"'Mark, also, that *faith*, and nothing else, is laid down here, and in this whole discourse (comp. v. 40: and chap. 3, 15, 16), as the condition of eternal life. The eating of Christ's flesh and the drinking of His blood, to be consistent with this, is only a stronger form of expressing the same idea of a real personal appropriation of Christ by faith. This refutes all forms of ecclesiasticism which throw any kind of obstruction between the soul and Christ as an essential condition of salvation, whether it be the authority of Pope, or Council, or Creed, or system of theology, or the intercession of saints, or good works of our own. Salvation depends solely and exclusively upon personal union with Christ; all other things, however important in their place, are subordinate to this.

Without faith in Christ there can be no salvation for any sinner; this is the exclusiveness of the gospel; but with faith in Christ there is salvation for all, of whatever sect or name. This is charity.'

"Enough has now been said by us and quoted from the volume before us, to commend it strongly to all earnest students of the Bible. Although this commentary exhibits great learning, and must prove most helpful to the advanced scholar, it is also adapted to general use. Every thoughtful layman, given to any proper study of the Scriptures, can learn much from it, and would find most of its pages sufficiently plain for practical instruction.

"To students of theology in our schools of training for the ministry, this volume, with the others of the series, will afford assistance which they can find nowhere else. And those especially who may be in any peril of High-Church sacramentarianism would find it one of the surest safeguards against the danger besetting them. The sincere thanks of the Church are due to Dr. Schaff for the fidelity and courage with which he has done his work."

[From the foregoing lucid exposition, many of our readers will not fail to be reminded of the contrast between it and the forced and unusual explanation which is frequently given from the pulpit by some brethren to this beautiful chapter of the "disciple whom Jesus loved." We have on two occasions heard prominent brethren of the new views quoting, for instance, from the sixth chapter of John, the verses from fifty-three to fifty-nine, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man," etc., and then giving the explanation that in the Lord's Supper the very body and blood of Christ was partaken, and that just as these words stand there; that "Christ does not stop to give any explanation to these words" (we quote verbatim from one brother), even when objections were made to such phraseology; adding that "the popular view of the modern Churches on this point was '*Rationalism* of the baldest kind.'" In both cases verse sixty-three was not only not quoted, but not the most distant allusion was made to it; whilst that verse, in connection with the one following, is the very key to the proper understanding of the chapter. "The eating of Christ's flesh, and the drinking of His blood, is only a stronger form of expressing the same idea of a real personal appropriation of Christ by faith." If this is Rationalism, then may God give us a large measure of it!]

I.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC SYSTEM.

FROM DR. DORNER'S ARTICLE.

We regard the essay of Prof. J. A. Dorner, D.D., which he read at the Evangelical Alliance in New York, on the *Infallibility of the Pope*, which is now a dogma of the Roman Catholic Church, as the ablest paper we have ever perused on that subject. It is a perfect piece of mosaic,—

thoroughly and compactly put together by the hand of a master-artist. It does not content itself with combating the mere outer scaffolding of popery; it is no skirmishing with small arms upon the turrets and pinnacles of the Vatican, as the manner of some is, but it takes us into its very centre and points out every stone in the deceptive structure, and how and why these stones are thus and so intimately constructed and fitted together to produce certain ends and results. As many of the readers of this work may not have seen the essay, we will not confine our extracts merely to those few paragraphs (at the close) which bear more directly on the subject under consideration in these pages.

The following are the introductory words of Dr. Dorner, which show us at once the spirit of the man:

"It is a righteous indignation which is felt against the Council of the Vatican, that it should sanction a dogma of such fearful and far-reaching importance as the Infallibility of the Pope; and it is the duty of pure and evangelical Christianity to contend against its doctrine and life. But in order to contend successfully we must understand our adversaries, must discern the roots of the errors, which are powerful only in that they are connected with great truths. And again, in order to contend as Christians, we must strive with sorrow and sympathy, with that love which would have our brethren likewise in possession of the truth, and which does not proudly exalt itself above the communions, but is mindful of our own infirmity and sin, which, manifold and contradictory as it appears, is yet fundamentally one; and it is just so with error.

"In this spirit I would treat both parts of my theme, in order that we may strengthen one another in the common joy of the pure gospel, whose light has been restored by the Reformation, fruitful in blessings, as the mother of us all.

THE ERROR OF THE INFALLIBILITY DOGMA.

. . . "But, nevertheless, we cannot justly understand this powerful error without seeing its connection with Christian truths whose caricature it is. We cannot master it entirely until we clearly and purely apprehend the evangelical truth of which it is the counterpart. The Infallibility of the Pope could not have become a dogma without the consent of the bishops. Why did they yield? not only those who for a long time had acted as mere servants and menials of the Pope, not only those accustomed to regard religion as a mere mechanical ceremonial service, whilst, without astonishment, they added this dogma to other dogmas, yea, merely wondered why others regarded the matter as serious—but other bishops likewise, of more earnest spirit and deeper religious interests? Why did the German bishops particularly submit themselves? At first, part of them bravely resisted. At the beginning, they, not less than the Old Catholics, drew back with horror from this dogma, as a mystery of lies, which, after it had secretly matured in Rome, suddenly stepped forth before the world with shamelessness and arrogance. But their opposition became weaker and more lukewarm, until at last they capitulated with resignation. I

shall not acquit them of cowardice and fear of man; but the human heart is deep and strong in self-deceptions and artifices. The entire episcopal order would not have submitted themselves with so much unanimity had they not supposed that only in this way could they preserve great Christian possessions.

"(*b.*) This infallibilism is a machine well calculated to compel obedience, nominal and real, to an appearance, a phantom, of unity; but it likewise renders the original substance of Christianity unsafe and uncertain, and robs it of its internal redemptive value. For in accordance with this system the substance of Christianity is essentially indifferent, if only this one thing is maintained, the recognition of the formal authority of the Roman oracle (consequently of the Divine form), that formal authority is thus invested with the Divine right of providing whatever it thinks best with the Divine stamp of truth; that is, that the whole tendency of modern Catholicism is to make the entire substance of Christianity questionable or worthless by the form in which all value is placed.

* * * * * * * *

"(*d.*) What is assurance without truth? Error can never give assurance of itself, but merely unsafe, fluctuating opinion; for our spirit is destined for the truth, in which alone it finds its home, its rest, and its peace. We cannot make the truth; must accept it as it is and as it proves itself to be by its ability to give us full and Divine assurance of itself. Now the Pope would make truth to be truth, so indeed that he holds and claims that what he speaks is inspired; and not only is he involved in the arbitrariness of subjectivism, but likewise all those who obey him; for their arbitrary will elected him to be the head and oracle of the Church. While he uses his arbitrary will to command and govern, his Church uses its freedom to renounce freedom and abdicate it. Both are alike arbitrary, both are equally guilty.

"(*e.*) The assurance respecting Christianity sought in this way flees from us. And it is the same with the unity of the Church, as we have seen. What is the unity of the Church without truth? It is a formalism. The dictatorship of the one and the obedience of the other may constitute an ecclesiastical empire having the external appearance of unity; but without the truth and the spirit it is a hollow mockery, an empty pretense. Such an ecclesiastical body lacks the immediate communion of its members with the living God, and is a dualism throughout.

"(*f.*) How very different that unity of the Church which is constituted and cherished by the word of the Spirit and the truth! It is peaceable, friendly, and salutary to all the institutions of nature, such as marriage, the family, and the State. But the empire of the Pope desires to be a spiritual empire above all States, and yet is itself only a form of government indued with almost all the attributes of the State, even the power of coercion, thereby becoming hurtful to religion, which can only thrive in the atmosphere of freedom, and is moreover hostile to the State, which is conscious of its office and endeavors to realize its own idea. For the empire of the Pope is a government which would pervade entire Christendom and all of its States, supreme above

them all even in external affairs; a second State in every State, so that it must sooner or later come in collision with every one of them that does not submit itself. It is a great error, as we have seen in Germany, to suppose that the State can avoid this conflict by not troubling itself about this Church. If the State does not trouble itself about this Church, it will trouble itself about the State, and appropriate more and more the State's prerogatives.

* * * * * * * *

"Since the Pope henceforth takes this position, a great change awaits the Catholic Church, demanding our deepest sympathy. For ought it not to grieve us that so large a portion of Christendom which Christ has redeemed should again fall so low as that, under the name and appearance of unity, the Romish Church should become a despotism, the most absolute monarchy ever known? Herein, likewise, is involved a rupture of unity, a dualism, by which the uniformity and unity of the members in participation in the Holy Spirit is done away with, since the wisdom and will of the Holy Spirit are said to concentrate themselves in one member, while the others, called by the Apostle Peter 'a royal priesthood,' are said not to have their immediate part in the Holy Spirit, but only through the high priest. Does not this renew the distinction of the religion of priests before Christ, with a boldness hitherto unknown? What a disunion such a unity brings within the body of the Roman Catholic Church itself! Christ says that the water he will give is to be a well of waters springing up in the believer himself unto everlasting life. The new dogma will no longer have the Holy Spirit to dwell independently in the members; they are not to have wells of life, streaming forth from the mysterious depths of the water of the Divine Spirit and word; but merely passive channels for the water which is to flow forth from the Tiber to Rome to enrich the globe. What then is the unity of Christians with one another, for which our Lord prays in His intercessory prayer, if Christian brotherhood is merely a communion in servitude and nonage under an infallible Pope? Not less painful is the fact that this dogma erects a new wall of separation between the Roman Catholics and the rest of Christendom, not only against us and the Orientals, but likewise against the promise of the Lord respecting the one fold and the one Shepherd, by which He did not mean a Pope.

* * * * * * * *

NOMINAL PROTESTANTISM.

"We have thus been brought to the consideration of evangelical Christianity. And, that we may not give ourselves over to ecclesiastical pride, we must not forget the evils of nominal Protestantism existing among us, against which we have to contend.

"Evangelical Christianity is the freeborn daughter of the Reformation. It has reconciled the principles of Authority and Freedom in the moral and religious sphere. For the gospel proves itself to evangelical faith as a power of God; the believer is overcome in his intelligence, will, and feelings by the spiritual power of redeeming truth

in Christ, and thus has first of all an assurance of personal salvation in Christ, a subjective knowledge of himself as redeemed, and then at the same time an objective knowledge of the Redeemer, of His Divine power and grace. This victory of truth as light and life is at the same time victory over doubt, skepticism, disunion, and enmity with God. In one word, man by faith is restored to unity with himself and God, to unity of Christian character, and that is the foundation of all true unity of men in the Church. For how could there be unity of the Church if its members have chaotic and internally discordant elements within their own persons? And, on the other hand, how can those who are born of God refrain from loving their kindred of the Divine seed?"

[After showing that unless there is constant renewal of the truth from generation to generation, room will be found for error and departure from the simple truth, on the one hand in the way of an overvaluing of authority, on the other, arbitrary freedom (hierarchism and rationalism), he proceeds as follows:]

THE ROMANIZING TENDENCY.

"I. Alarmed by the abuse of freedom, on the one side, others flee from freedom altogether. Lest they should open the door to disorganizing arbitrariness, they imprison Christianity itself; lest they should give room to subjectivism, they lead the way to an objectivism which is human bondage. Church authority is made the basis of faith; the symbols of the Church, and their formula, are placed above the Bible; Church tradition is most scrupulously guarded, not because it is the truth, but because it is tradition, and thus there is a zeal for evangelical doctrines which are based merely on tradition. Many, who are especially anxious for the credit of orthodoxy, subordinate the study of the Scriptures to the symbolical books and the ancient dogmatical writers. They are annoyed when the believer in the study of the Scripture shows the necessity of harmonizing more completely Church doctrine with the Bible. They are sluggish in the fulfillment of the duty of the true scribe, in bringing out of the treasure of the heart things new and old. (Matthew xiii. 52.) There is a tendency, still more extended, to substitute for the ancient, conscious, personal form of piety, an impersonal form, which lives in shadowy and æsthetic feelings of an indefinite kind. This they accomplish by means of gorgeous ceremonial and manifold symbolism; by subordinating the preaching of the word to the liturgy and the sacrament; by the propagation of Christianity rather by cramming the mind with Christian material than by leading to Christian knowledge and the personal appreciation of the truth of salvation; by sensuous forms and ceremonials, to which spiritual indolence ascribes the power of pervading the entire man, as a fluid with magical influence. And connected with this there is likewise an unevangelical emphasis of the power of the keys, and a Romanizing distinction between the clergy and laity, which is rooted in the unevangelical doctrine of sacramental ordination. This method, which is a reaction from evangelical Christianity, is unfruitful in religion, is unsuited to the needs of the present age,

and to the ever-youthful gospel and its regenerative powers. It is related to the present as a peevish old man who would carefully guard a rich inheritance, yet allows it to rust and spoil, because he does not increase it by use and does not continually coin and distribute the noble metal of the gospel. The Church will never in this way prevail over the masses of the people who are estranged from it. Rather, this leaven of Romanism which has again been brought in leads back behind the Reformation, of which it speaks with unhappy retractions and regrets, while it takes away or shakes the evangelical assurance of faith, destroys the present evangelical unity, misleads, if not to apostasy to Rome, yet to weak effort to establish on evangelical soil a miniature popedom in every congregation. But we cannot linger longer by this foul stream, which now flows through the Evangelical Church of more than one land. It has already been condemned by what has been said with reference to the modern Romish Church, of which it is but a dwarfish, inconsistent copy."

[At the close of the essay, Dr. Hitchcock, Professor in the Union Theological Seminary in New York, who followed in an address on the same general subject, rose and said: "We have all listened with great satisfaction to the admirable paper which has just been read. I have in my mind only one living theologian who might think to better it; and that is Dr. Dorner *himself*. The fault must be our own if we are not more firmly rooted in the conviction that, in adding to its creed this new dogma of Papal Infallibility, the Roman Catholic Church has both erred and blundered."]

J.

HE WAS NOT "PROPERLY" BAPTIZED.

As an illustration to what lengths men will go who are fanatically exercised about the exclusive and "supernatural powers of the priesthood," we give the following from a religious paper in London, of a recent date. The clergyman referred to was, of course, one of the advanced ritualists,—probably one of the four hundred and eighty-three who lately petitioned the archbishop for a regular permit to exercise their gifts in the confessional, but against which Lord Shaftesbury, at a large public meeting in Exeter Hall, in London, protested, saying, among other things, "If bishops yield, and if rubrics are enacted to authorize, then let bishops and rubrics all go! We know the Bible, and we will carry it with us; and we know history, and therefore need no experiment to learn what debasement is made on the minds of dupes of the confessional, or the power for evil it puts into the hands of confessors."

The article referred to is as follows:

"The clergy appear determined to precipitate disestablishment. We should have thought that now, if ever, especially with the fate of the

Irish Church before them, they would have at least learned discretion, if not justice; but it seems that even this very modest estimate of their capabilities is futile. What might the Shah, for instance, think of the following unvarnished statement of how English priestcraft, acting up to the strict letter of the prayer-book, outrages our common humanity? A fortnight ago, a little boy, named Arthur Pickford, and aged five years, was drowned at Seaton, in the river Axe. He was playing by the water, when he was swept off his legs by a tidal wave and drowned. The interment was arranged to take place in Seaton churchyard, but upon the body reaching the place the clergyman refused to allow any service to be performed, as the child had not been properly baptized.* Here is the published account of the funeral: 'The grief of the mourners was heart-rending. The poor mother, on looking round and seeing the coffin being silently lowered into the little grave, exclaimed, in agonizing tones, "Will no one say a single prayer for my darling child?" and, finding no response, she dropped upon her knees and uttered a few sentences, which went to the hearts of all present, and brought tears into every eye.' We are glad to find that a very general feeling of indignation has been aroused, and that even the local journals, which are usually inclined to preserve silence in such matters, speak out well. How, then, can it be wondered at, it is asked, amid the laxity and moral cowardice of late years, that the laity should at last wake up to find that the priesthood of this century is identical with that of times called something very different,—that the spirit is precisely the same as that by which the fires of Smithfield were lighted and lively Christians burned each other for the love of God? Human nature is very uniform, and it is natural enough that the love of power and the effects of superstition and over-zeal in strong and even strictly conscientious natures, when encouraged by the apathy or blindness of those most immediately affected, should in time produce such fruits as those by which the public feeling is at length aroused."

FREE PRAYER, OR ONLY PRAYER FROM THE BOOK?

An eminent and highly successful living Reformed pastor in Switzerland says, in reference to this subject, that, "say what we will, the fact is undeniable, that the free spoken prayer is more efficacious and tends to greater edification of the people than that which is read from the book; and especially is this the case among people outside the larger towns and cities. He does not wish the minister to ascend the pulpit without having in his own mind and *heart*, as it were, prayed and thought over the subject-matter of his intended prayer, without which

---

* "*Properly baptized.*" Roman Catholics (and High Churchmen elsewhere) lay great stress on the "intention." If a minister with *low* views of baptism, for instance, baptizes a child, he could not have had the "intention" that that child should, through the act, be regenerated; and so the baptism would be vitiated. Thus, an intelligent woman in the Reformed Church, whose then pastor held very *high* views, said to me, among other strange things, "Since we know what our Church *used* to teach about baptism, we will not allow any minister to baptize our children who has not the right *intention* on the subject." It will, therefore, not surprise any one to be told that, on her pastor removing to another place, she and her family joined another church, where, as she supposed, the intention figment was believed in.

he could not feel himself in sympathy with the congregation. But having done this, in a devout and prayerful spirit,—with all the needs, the trials, the sorrows of his members present to his own soul,—he is then best prepared to pray *with* them and *for* them most perfectly, far better than to go over a form,—may-be a very good one,—according to the book, and that, too, the ever-returning self-same one, and nothing else."

"I have," he continues, "already directed attention to the fact how many painful experiences we meet with in the religious life of our people, and how often we find such a reliance upon the heartless performance of some outward duties; and in the family, how often great stress is laid upon the mere observance of family prayer, with little or no regard as to *how* it is done; and hence many seem to be well satisfied with themselves, because they read a prayer from some book, be it never so heartlessly, as if that really were prayer. And now when the minister in the church does the same thing, must these people not be strengthened in such wrong views? I cannot withhold in this connection a death-bed scene as being in point. The child of a worthy family in the village was very ill. The father describes the case himself, thus: 'My poor wife was so overcome that she had to sit down with the dear child in her arms. "O Lord God, shall it come to this, that this my child shall be taken?" she sobbed. "Will God chastise us so severely? Oh, Peter, pray that God would spare it to us:" I took our prayer-book and seated myself by the side of the dimly-shining lamp, and, half crying, and with earnest devotion, began to read a prayer for times of sickness. "Not so, Peter!" she said, "not so! that will be of no use; *there is nothing in that about our sick child.* Pray that it would please Him to let us keep our child." I then turned over the leaves, and began to read another prayer with increased earnestness. "And that, too, will do no good," she said; "do pray *out of yourself*, just as it comes to you, but *about our child*, just about *it*." I rose up from the lamp, with a heart full of fear,—fear and anxiety for the child, and fear about the prayer to be uttered; for in that way, by myself and *out of myself*, I had never before prayed. And then my wife sank down upon her knees, and in the deep agony of her soul cried to God.'"

DIVINE WORSHIP IN TWO CONGREGATIONS.

[The following is translated from the "*Evangelical Reformed Church Gazette*" of Germany, in which it appeared as a communication from the Rev. Dr. Treviranus, pastor of one of the largest Reformed churches in Bremen. Dr. T. was one of the most able, genial, and devoted servants of God whom it was our privilege to meet during our first visit to Europe in 1843. He now rests with God. The reader will doubtless be interested in the description here given, and at the same time will also learn how such a sound, learned, and godly man looked at things which at present concern the Reformed Church in America.]

"Basle and Hamburg! Widely apart, both nearly at the extremities of the Fatherland,

" Where still the German tongue doth ring,
And German hymns to God in heaven we sing.

"With many differences, they have still much in common. Both cities, though differing in size, are seats of great wealth and trade. Both are central points of free States. The one is an old home of the Reformed Church; the other, formerly at least, a strong bulwark of Lutheranism, from which so many a passage at arms was made against the 'Calvinists.' Joachim Westphal, Erdmann, Neumeister, Melchior Goetze, who thundered against the Reformed from this city, are not forgotten. But all this is past now, and a new time has come. In Hamburg they have become modernized, whilst what was beautiful and good in Basle has been preserved and restored. Clearly to see this, we need but refer to the two churches in which the writer was permitted to be present one Sunday morning, namely, in the large St. Michael's in Hamburg, and in the Minster (Cathedral) in Basle. To the former we yield the palm in respect to acoustics, whilst its general appearance, as well within as without, with its architectural style in the time of Louis XIV., impresses one unpleasantly. But the Swiss Cathedral has been restored to its old beauty.

"If the architect could once more return, he would be full of thanks to the later generation which has so well understood how to purify the thoroughly harmonious edifice from the disfiguring additions, and to banish the old red color, so that the stones now look as though they had just come from the quarry.

"Here, in Basle, on a Sunday forenoon, the beautiful chimes called the congregation together. The older families of Basle have, for the most part, yielded up their property-right to their seats. Nearly all the seats are free. In devout silence the mass of the congregation assembled. When the bells ceased, the organ intoned; soon it passed over into a choral melody, and the whole congregation now sang two stanzas out of the excellent Basle hymn-book. It was a devotional singing,—praying in singing; and singing prayerfully is, in truth, the appropriate aim of congregational singing. Here it was disturbed by no noisy coming and going. The soul became silent and collected for the prayer which the minister now offered. *There was no responding congregation, no liturgical succession of formulas*, but a hearty confession of sin, and a believing calling upon that name in whom alone there is salvation. It was worship 'in *the spirit* and in *the truth*.' I could not help but think of this saying of our Lord, which the vulgar Rationalism in its day despoiled so often, until at last there was neither spirit nor truth in its Divine services; a saying which is in danger of being overlooked by laying such stress upon fixed forms and prescribed prayers, yea, even upon the *priestly posture* of the liturgist. Then followed the announcements. Then first the text, and an animated sermon on the word of God. All felt that *this* was the chief thing,—'building up themselves in their most holy faith.' This was followed in the usual way by prayer, singing, and the whole was concluded with the benediction.

"In Hamburg the sermon was preceded by lengthy singing. I opened the hymn-book at the number indicated by the tablet, but it

was not the right one. I looked into the book of my neighbor, and saw that they were singing, 'Come, Holy Spirit, Son of God.' This beautiful hymn by Luther was unchanged; but the singing was greatly disturbed by frequent coming in and rising up. There still exists in Hamburg the bad custom, that women (appointed for the purpose) point out seats to those who have none of their own; these go, singing out of the open hymn-books, hither and thither, and when they catch a glimpse of a stranger they take charge of him and usher him into a seat, for which afterward, during the Divine service, the women collect from each a shilling, by means of boxes. The three verses came to an end, and I again looked for the designated hymn, but it was still another hymn, and the whole of 'To God alone on high be praise' was sung. When this was concluded, commenced the hymn 'Heart and heart be knit together.' After a few verses, the minister entered the pulpit. At other times I had noticed it as a beneficial result of long singing that the people became hungry, as it were, for the word, and this, then, would in truth be a compensation for it, since it is quite difficult to sing so long with devotion.

"This hunger was then satisfied, for there followed a decidedly biblical, spiritual sermon on the epistle for the day. Rejoiced and edified, we left the church. Here also there was no liturgy, but here, as in Basle, the chief thing took the most prominent place, namely, the preaching of the word of God; all the rest, whatever weight we may attach to it, is and remains subordinate. *The word* has the promise, and in truth,—not the word mediated in manifold ways, even although the Lord can give His blessing also to this; but the simple proclamation that there is salvation in no other, and that no other name is given unto men whereby we can be saved. The *spoken word*, with demonstration of the Spirit and of power! Therefore the member of the Reformed Church could be edified as well in Hamburg as in Basle. When on a former occasion I heard Claus Harms preach, and took sincere delight in his sermon, I was still compelled to leave the church with the silent thanksgiving in my heart that I was Reformed. For, after the sermon, the minister pronounced the benediction from the pulpit, and then went down to the so-called altar (it was in the afternoon, and there was no communion), and sang the same over again before the same assemblage. I was not able to realize the adage, *Superflua non nocent* (*i.e.*, 'superfluous things do no harm')."

LITURGICAL SERVICE, ETC.

Luther went to Rome with the expectation of finding there the nearest approach to God and a foretaste of heavenly peace and comfort, for which his soul ardently longed. "There," he thought, "dwells the Holy Father, and there I shall find so many of the holy servants of Christ, that it must needs be the nearest approach to heaven to be in such company and to worship in those holy places." But just the very opposite effect was produced upon him. Never had he met with greater irreverence in priests, never with greater ungodliness and worldliness among the people. He came home with the conviction that it was rather the synagogue of Satan than the city of God, and that

corruption and debauchery dwelt nowhere else so fearfully under the cloak of religion, as in Rome, with all its gorgeous ritual.

The writer has frequently expressed the wish to some who are so loud in their denunciations of the "baldness of our Protestant Church service," that they might have the ocular demonstration of what is to be seen in Roman Catholic churches during their services in the classic home of this Church,—in France, in Italy, in Spain, *everywhere*, except in countries where Protestantism has exerted a reformatory effect upon priest and people. They would, like Luther, come home with quite different views and feelings, unless they had beforehand fully made up their minds to become submissive to all and singular the shams, the trickeries, the mountebankism of innumerable priests, and the mechanical, often most ludicrous, often blasphemous, irreverence and superstitious rehearsals of Ave Marias and Paternosters. That there are notable exceptions even there is fully admitted, but that they are only exceptions is equally true. On this point let us hear what the cool-headed, learned German theologian Dr. *Richard Rothe* says. He is writing to a friend from Rome, where he had spent some time. "I cannot tell you," he says, "how disgusted I am with what I have seen of the worship in the (Romish) churches here. How any Protestant can here have any desire to pass over to the Catholic Church is inexplicable to me. It is here (in Rome) that one only comes to the full measure of the conviction how much reason one has to be thankful to God for being a Protestant Christian."

A writer in the (Episcopal) *Church Journal* of New York City says:

"I desire to call to your notice the fact that we have within the pale of our Church some Roman Catholics *in disguise!* Last Sunday morning (September 21st) I attended the seven-o'clock communion at Trinity chapel, and noticed the following singular performances. When the Creed was said, the congregation bowed the head reverently (as was proper) at the name of Jesus; but what was my surprise to see several worshipers *kneel* at the sentence, 'born of the Virgin Mary,' and at its conclusion rise again; and others bowed more devoutly at the Virgin's name than at the name of their Saviour! When the communion had been received, and we were leaving the chancel-rail, I noticed one man in particular leave the chancel-rail, step back a few paces, and kneel with clasped hands, gazing at something on the ceiling of the chancel."

THE LITURGICAL SERVICE of the Episcopal Church, in the sense of the oldest and best of its writers, is deeply spiritual and evangelical. But for its frequent repetitions of the same forms in the same service, no serious objection could be made to it. And yet let any one go to most of the churches in London and elsewhere, and all the boasted devotion of a "rich churchly service in which the people join" vanishes like the morning cloud. Instead of "*all* the people praising God," it is a parcel of boys in white frocks, not unlike a certain private garment, rising and bowing, and, with the choir "up yonder," doing all, or nearly all, the responding, singing, and praying. So in Westminster Abbey, and so in most of the churches in which I attended in Europe. The exception to this I found—more than anywhere in any country—in Surrey Chapel, Dr. Newman Hall's Independent ("Puri-

tan") congregation of four thousand people, where a somewhat abbreviated form of the Episcopal Liturgy is used. There *all* the people sang, *all* the people joined in the service with life and spirit, and we felt like being in an evangelical congregation in Germany, where the *singing* of the majestic chorals was a liturgical service that lifted the heart up to God, and made you forget all the artistic flummery of "book, bell, and candle," or of "churchly vestments with gold trappings, and bowing and scraping boys," which so interests some minds in ritualistic places of worship. And that church in Surrey Chapel in London, with its liturgical worship, is composed of living Christians, made such by what is sneeringly decried as "Puritanism" or "Methodism." Just because the life of religion was *in the people*, did life flow forth *through them* from the *Liturgy*. The Liturgy did not create that *life*, but the life created the *Liturgy*. Let us first, then, be careful to have living, devoted congregations, and if then there is a want felt *by the people* for proper forms, they will come to hand in a natural way. But let us beware of thrusting upon the churches a ritualism, even if not objectionable in a doctrinal way, for which they have no heart, as if *this* would make them a whit better. There is a formalism with no forms, which is lamentable enough, but in multiplying forms you set about it systematically to produce and perpetuate formalism. Let us avoid all forced work, especially in public worship.

HOW RITUALISM PROGRESSES.

A Religious Order in the Episcopal Church.

It appears by some late publications that there exists in the Episcopal churches in England and America a religious order called "The Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament." The associates of the "American Branch" of this confraternity held their Annual Conference during the latter part of the month of June. There was much posturing and many processionals, and the conference was opened by "vespers," sung in St. Ignatius' Church, New York City, where Dr. Ewer* is celebrant, and who, it seems, is Superior-General of the American Branch of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament. The next morning there were "low masses" every hour at several of the advanced ritualistic churches in New York City. At the "seven-o'clock mass" at St. Ignatius' Church the celebrant was Dr. Quintard, Bishop of Tennessee, who was also figuring at Cape May about that

* This Dr. Ewer is the person who, two years ago, preached some sermons in which he tried to show that "Protestantism was a failure." We have not yet seen anything like a failure of Protestantism, but the papers have lately informed the public that he was lecturing in favor of Darwinism (that men are descended from monkeys). So, then, if this be true, Ewer himself has proved a failure, and a very considerable failure. Another person of the same order, a few months ago, preached a whining discourse in the West, about the "failure of the Protestant Church to draw the masses," and in two months after he was drawn into Holy Mother Church. Thus it proves the old saying to be true, that when men see all things wrong around them, there is generally something wrong in themselves. It is the easiest (and poorest) thing in the world to be forever finding fault with everything and everybody, but not so easy (nor so noble) a thing to render things better. The former class may be said to be moral dyspeptics, who deserve our pity more than our blame.

time. He seems to have been the only bishop mixed up in this mass-saying, and we hope that some of the evangelical people of his diocese will endeavor to find out from him what "low mass" means as administered by an Episcopal dignitary.

"High mass" also was celebrated at the Church of St. Mary the Virgin, and the preacher was Rev. Father Grafton, S.S., J.E., cabalistic initials which we cannot interpret. Dr. Ewer, Superior-General of the order, was re-elected, and gave an annual address, in which he congratulated his brothers that the principle of non-communicating attendance and the vital truth involved therein, viz., that the Blessed Eucharist is a holy sacrifice as well as a sacrament, had been successfully asserted in the General Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church; that there were now sixty-five priests-associate, as against twenty-one in 1869; that eucharistic vestments are worn in sixteen out of forty-one dioceses; and that eucharistic lights have recently, and without objection, been introduced in Trinity Church, New York.

Dr. Batterson, formerly of St. Clement's, Philadelphia, offered a resolution to the effect "That the secretary be directed to forward semi-annually to all priests-associate a printed list of all priests-associate, which list is to be considered confidential."

At the close of this business-meeting the *Anima Christi* was said, the prayers for the Confraternity and the repose of the souls of the dead were offered, and the conference was brought to a close.

Nothing has been said of all this in the American Episcopal papers; but the New York *Independent* "smoked it out" of a corner of an English High-Church journal.

HOW THE LEAVEN WORKS.

A Lutheran clergyman writes to the *Observer* as follows:

"Should any of our readers be privileged to spend a few Sabbaths in Baltimore, we would advise them to give two separate afternoons to Ritualism, one to St. Luke's, the other to Mount Calvary: either will do; both will satisfy you as to how far men and women can be Protestants in name and Romanists in heart. Enter Mount Calvary, as an illustration. The head does not call himself rector, but priest. Sisters are there in black garments and hoods, with white faces, gloomy and ghastly. A font of holy water stands at the door on entering; banners decorate the high altar, and candles blaze on every side. Here mass is said, or its full equivalent. Mary is recognized, and prayers to the Virgin, by her full title of Mother of God. Then begins the show, and the low chanting is heard afar off, very solemn, sepulchral, and theatrical. Then enters the procession, the audience bowing and crossing themselves; resplendent banners, boys gay in white somethings, very good imitations of genteel night-gowns, or some other under-garment. The priests tread majestically forward, like theatrical kings, mixed with the boys, who seem rather to enjoy the fun. Then enters the principal actor, the high-priest, with sad face and studied gait, moving to the altar, where he *kneels*, and behind him the assistant priest prostrates himself. Then—well, enough of this mockery—this stuff is called religion. We go away, partly in disgust, partly in sadness, and

we ask ourselves, Is this aping of Rome to reform the world? Is this the simple gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ? Why, reader, it would puzzle you even to give a list of the names of the parts of this show, the various garments, etc.; and yet we wonder that these people go over to Rome. We herald it through the press. We regard it as a strange thing. The only wonder ought to be, not that some go, but that any remain; for in Protestantism they know it is mockery, and in Rome it is consistent. It is sometimes asked by people who are in the habit of attending their own churches, and have no inclination to run about, whether these ritualistic churches are well attended. We answer, Yes—crowded. 'Sunday theatricals' it is called by many. People will have amusement, and Sunday is well observed in Baltimore. Theatres, etc., are closed, and hence you see the young folks moving up-town to witness the performance at St. Luke's or Mount Calvary. Very recently an old canon, peculiar to the Episcopal Church of Maryland, was abolished at the convention held in Baltimore. It referred to theatricals and other vain amusements. The Episcopalians of Maryland can now indulge with the brethren of other States and Churches; and, there being now no canon to reach theatricals and other vain amusements, we suppose St. Luke's and Mount Calvary, and others of that class, can flourish without protest. Bishop Whittingham suppressed Mount Calvary Church, on one occasion, for its mummeries, and since then its priest went over to Rome, and Bishop Whittingham now protests very justly against the abolition of the old canon. There may be some connection between them."

THE USE OF THE LITURGY IN CONGREGATIONS.

After the greater portion of this work had already been in type, it occurred to the author that an incidental allusion in regard to the use of the Liturgy might be misconstrued, and hence he allows himself to add the following in this place.

He would say, then, that as matters stand now, each congregation has the right to have the Liturgy introduced in public worship or not, as seems best to it. We deem this a most undesirable state of things, as tending to great diversity instead of uniformity in the public worship of the sanctuary. But the Synod has so ordered it, and the General Synod in Dayton has settled the matter. No minister, however, and no Consistory even, has the right to introduce that form of worship without the consent of the people. The book has not been *adopted* by the Synod. It simply *allowed its use*. The 44th Article of the Constitution says that in the spiritual concerns of a congregation none but communicants are entitled to vote, and it implies, of course, that a change in the form of worship, which is a spiritual concern, is to be decided by them. So it was explained at Dayton by all who spoke on the side of the Liturgy, according to the reports published in the *Messenger*.

Dr. Nevin says in his pamphlet, *The Liturgical Question*, "It must ever be worse than folly to think of carrying any measure of this sort, with a religious denomination like ours, without its own most general if not *entirely universal consent*."

At the General Synod in Dayton Dr. Apple said:

"It is for them [the churches] to determine whether they will accept and use it."

Dr. Gans said: "We owe it to the *people* to say what they want in an order of worship."

Dr. Nevin: "Are you not willing to trust the people? Do you know better than they what they want?"

Dr. Gerhart: "It must be submitted to the people. I am not afraid of its going down to the people" [not the minister merely, nor the Consistory merely].

Dr. Russell: "Let the Liturgy therefore go to the churches for optional use and trial." And similarly they all spoke.

It is plain, therefore, that the churches, as such, are to decide for themselves in this matter. This is in accordance with the Constitution, and also, as we have just seen, with the fully-expressed sentiments of the representatives of the General Synod, which *allowed* the use of the Liturgy. Christian prudence, however, would dictate to a minister that he ought not to introduce it, unless it can be done without offense to any, or at least any considerable number, of his members; because its use is, in any view, not essential, and, as Dr. Nevin has said, the Reformed Church got along without a Liturgy before, and it can do so still.

"INFANT BAPTISM."

Professor Doctor Luthardt (Lutheran) says: "Once when Jewish mothers brought their children to Jesus to bless them, and the disciples would have repelled them because these little children understood as yet nothing of the matter, Jesus expressly reproved them, and took the children in His arms, laid His hands upon them, and blessed them. [He did not say that they were "under the power of the devil."] And why should not we, too, bring our children to Him, and feel certain that He receives them and gives them His blessing? It is of this that baptism is the expression." And in a note it is added:

"Matt. xix. 13, seq.; Mark x. 13, seq.; Luke xviii. 15, seq. Thus were the disciples taught the position occupied by children with respect to the kingdom of heaven. Baptism in Church times corresponds with the blessing then bestowed on children by the Lord Jesus."—*Saving Truths*, p. 240.

"SACERDOTAL ABSOLUTION."

The following are the concluding objections against a published sermon on the above theme, by the Rev. M. A. Curtis, of the Episcopal Church in North Carolina. The review is from the pen of the late Dr. J. Addison Alexander, and is found in the *Princeton Review*, vol. xvii. The whole article is able and thorough, like everything from that remarkable man.

"Our fifth objection to the doctrine [of sacerdotal absolution] is that, as a theory, it is part and parcel of a system of falsehood, from which it cannot be detached without gross inconsistency and arbitrary violence. Among the unscriptural and dangerous doctrines which it presupposes,

or to which it leads, is the doctrine that the Apostles were the original recipients of the Holy Ghost, whom they alone had the power to communicate by the imposition of hands; that they transmitted this power to their episcopal successors; that in every ordination by a bishop, sanctifying grace and supernatural power are imparted; that all who are thus ordained priests have power to make the sacraments effectual means of communicating the benefits of redemption, the power, as even Protestants express it, of making the body and blood of Christ; that in the Eucharist the sacrifice of Christ is really repeated, or at least so commemorated as to secure the pardon of sin; that it is only by participation in the sacraments, thus administered, that men can be sanctified and saved. With the priestly power to forgive sins is connected, on the one hand, the necessity of specific confession, and, on the other, the infallibility of the Church; with that, the denial of the right of private judgment; and with that, the necessity of persecution. To one who goes the whole length of these errors, their connection and agreement can but serve to strengthen his convictions; but to those who shrink from any of them, it ought to be a serious consideration that they stand in the closest logical relation to the plausible and cherished dogma of sacerdotal absolution.

"Our sixth objection to the doctrine is that it is practically a subversion of the gospel, a substitution of human mediation for the mediation of Christ, and an exaltation of the priest into the place of God. It is easily said that the power arrogated by the clergy is derivative and delegated; that it is God who pardons and Christ who makes the throne of grace accessible, just as it may be said and is said that the papist who adores an image uses it only as a help to his devotion while he worships God. The profession may in either case be honest, but in neither case can it avail to change the practical result, to wit, that God is neglected or forgotten in the idol of the priest. Instead of that dependence on the Spirit and the word, which form an indispensable condition of Christ's promise to His people, the clergy are invested with authority, first, to decide what is Scripture; then to determine what the Scripture means; and then what is to be believed as matter of faith, though not contained in Scripture; while at the same time they alone have power to forgive the sins of men. This practical restriction of the power to determine what is sin and to forgive sin, in the hands of a certain class of ministers, as such, without regard to their character and standing before God, is the sum, essence, and soul of Antichrist; the constituent principle of that very power which has debauched and enslaved the world; of the power which sits in the temple of God; the mystery of iniquity, sustained by the working of Satan with all power, the power of the sword, the power of learning, the power of superstition, the power of an evil conscience, the power of lying wonders, a power which has held and will hold the world in subjection till the Lord shall consume it with the Spirit of His mouth and destroy it by the brightness of His coming. The gospel thus preached is 'another gospel,' and the doctrine which tends to such a practical result is and must be false.

"To such of our readers as are satisfied, by these or any other arguments, that forgiveness of sins is not a sacerdotal function, that the

Christian ministry is not a priesthood, that the power of remission was not given to the ministry, that the power of absolute effectual remission was not given at all, that the contrary hypothesis is one link in a chain of fearful errors, and practically tends to the subversion of the gospel, we may now say what we waived our right to say before, to wit, that the doctrine of sacerdotal absolution is unscriptural, dishonoring to God, and incompatible with human fallibility and weakness.

"In the course of our argument, and at its close, the question naturally presents itself, What is the Church to which the power of remission has been granted? how does it act, how can it be consulted, what relation has it to the Christian ministry? These are inquiries of the highest moment, and the answer to them is really involved in the preceding argument. But a direct and full solution is not necessary to the negative conclusions which we have endeavored to establish, and may be better given in another place."

"GOING BACKWARD."

This has been a favorite expression with some of our brethren who have *gone forward* pretty far on the "inclined plane," as Dr. Dorner calls it. They justify this by saying that the Reformed Church had done so in some other things,—with the Creed, for instance, which had been greatly undervalued, but was *now* restored in these latter days as an authoritative symbol; and so also in regard to "educational religion," which had pushed aside "wild-fire fanaticism," so threateningly dangerous in the Church at one time. Now, on these two little illustrative references I wish to say a few words.

And first, When was the Creed undervalued in the Reformed Church any more than it is now? Was it not always taught in the instruction of our youth? Can a dozen ministers be named in the whole Eastern Synod who neglected it in this way? There were some—*foreigners*, perhaps—who did so; I mean those who came from other denominations. The great, the overwhelming majority of our ministers instructed their young people in the Catechism, in which the Creed is explained with great simplicity and beauty; not indeed in the new, forced, and unnatural sense which is now attempted to be given to it, and which was *never*—I say NEVER—before given to it, nay, not even in the fourth nor in the fourteenth century. And so also in reference to "wild-fire fanaticism." The Church—I speak of the Eastern portion particularly—was but very partially affected (or afflicted) by extreme measures in and through *our own ministry*. Those portions of it where the evil was most felt were acted upon from outside of the Reformed Church, especially by one denomination with which our own is so closely connected. It is true that some of our ministers, under the pressure and force of outward circumstances, were in some instances led to adopt measures that were of doubtful expediency. But these were rare; they were exceptional cases. So that this hue and cry, started by one or two men and now taken up at second and third hand by younger brethren, is really an affair of moonshine, or at least dealing in stilted exaggerations. I speak that which I know. I had as good an opportunity of knowing the status of the Church

at the period referred to as any one else, because of the position in which I was then placed and my frequent mingling with pastors and people in almost every part of the Church. And I remember well that a few of the brethren who were then sympathizing with the "new measures" to some extent, thought that *I* was too "old-fogyish" for them (that was the word) to be invited to preach at their religious meetings, as once, but who have since gone "up" and "forward" so high and so far that we cannot again touch hands.

No: our Church, as a whole, did not greatly suffer in that direction from within our own bosom, but from without. She suffered much more, I think, from too much *cold* than too much *heat*, and I greatly fear such is the case in a degree to this day. This was the judgment of one of our professors twenty years ago, when traveling over Eastern Pennsylvania. When one of the worthy but very *easy* ministers told him that the "Albrights" were creating some trouble in his country charge, the professor replied, "A little stirring of the stagnant waters here, I should judge, would do you good; for you need it." Hence the illustrations which some of the younger brethren are so fond of bringing forward to show that, as in these things the new-theory movement was for good, *therefore* it must be good to go back *still farther*, is a *non-sequitur:* in other words, it will not hold. The *premises* are not true. It is far from being true that the Church then (thirty years ago) "was ready to fall over into wild-fireism." It is an effort to "raise funds on a fictitious capital." When Dr. Nevin's tract on the *Anxious Bench* appeared, the feverish excitement which had prevailed was nearly at its end. That tract came in good time, and strengthened the sober and sobering second thought of many in the Lutheran Church and also in our own. It did good, unquestionably; but it is too much to say that the tract put a stop to the epidemic. It had in great measure run its course. Nor was it all unmixed evil. Many who were then brought into the Church under the "high-pressure system," as it is called, are among the stable, bright members and ministers of the Church now, some of these in our own Church, and several even among the *advanced* side of it!

This "going back" is well enough within proper limits. But we have, alas! already seen that there is a going back that tendeth *toward* and *into* Rome. And yet, with all the heedlessness of ardent youth, sober-minded men will write and preach up to us this "going back," in order to go gloriously forward according to the "law of development"—a word of such charming sound—and the "law of progress." Thus discourseth a writer in the *Messenger* of September 17, 1873:

"Will not Protestantism be forced, by the law of progress itself, to approach the Church of Rome both theologically and practically; not to fall over helplessly and blindly into her arms [of course not blindly, but with eyes wide open], but to cope with her in the theoretical and practical issues of our common Christian faith? [But, my dear child, old mother is too old to learn from you, and you are very green to expect to gain her over to you.] Is not this the only way in which she can be brought to abandon her errors and to yield to the just and sacred demands of personal freedom? There seems to be clearly a fixed and absolute necessity of going backward in this case also, that a triumph-

ant going forward in the grand solution of the gigantic problems of the last times may follow as a result. We settle no dogmas now; we mean only to suggest ideas: let time show whether these ideas are in accord with the law of historical development, the law of life and salvation to the world." [The "dogmas" are all fixed, like the laws of the Medes and Persians, in the Roman Church. Time will show that your laws are no laws at all, but a mere *ignis fatuus*.]

THE "DEFECTS" OF THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE.

Whilst the last pages of this work are passing through the press, the *Reformed Church Messenger* of December 10 contains an article from one of the professors at Lancaster on the late meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in New York, which claims some notice.

The criticism is presented, we are told in the introduction, "not in an unfriendly spirit," for it is rather "an act of friendship to look at the defects as well as the merits of that assemblage."

1. The first defect which he notices is, that "it failed to represent all sections of Protestantism. It was predominantly *Presbyterianism*. Germany was but 'partially represented.' But few delegates, comparatively, from that country were present."

2. But the *greatest* defect, he thinks, "was the absence of a *Lutheran representation*." There was one there, it is true, besides Dr. Conrad, but he "felt that the Alliance was entirely one-sided, and could not properly represent Protestantism; and so he read his essay, a philosophical one, and merely looked on." . . . "Lutheranism was there only through politeness, not to speak a great *Lutheran word*. Dr. Krauth could have done that; he has already uttered it in his able work on the Conservative Theology."

3. "Then the Alliance failed in representing what may be called the churchly side of Protestantism." The professor adds that he would like to see even a broader discussion than this to be had, and if the Roman [Catholic] Church would consent, he would like to see "Roman and Protestant issues discussed."

Now, as to the first defect adverted to, we have only to say that if "Presbyterianism" was more largely represented than others in the Alliance, it would seem to show clearly that Presbyterians took a more heartfelt interest in that meeting. Why were some other Churches not more fully represented (the Reformed from this country, for instance)? Just because they preferred to "look on" merely, or even preferred to prejudice ministers and people *against* the Alliance. Should they now complain against "one-sided" representation in that body, when they themselves, perhaps, were the very persons who prevented a larger representation?—As for *Germany* being but "partially represented," we wish to say that it is to be regretted that providential circumstances prevented some of the most sincere friends of the cause and some of the brightest lights of that country from being present on the occasion. *Tholuck*, unable from bodily infirmity to be present, was there, however, by a written paper; *Dr. von Hoffmann*, the eminent Prussian court-preacher, died just prior to the time of the meeting; *Tischendorff*, the renowned Oriental Christian scholar, became par-

alyzed; and some others were prevented by similar causes from being present. And yet Germany was not feebly nor "partially" represented, taking all things into account. *Dorner, Christlieb, Fliedner, Krummacher, Noël* (of Berlin), *Boegner, Prof. Witte, Prof. Dr. Kraft, Count Bernstorff, Dr. Zimmermann*, and perhaps others, were there. Surely this was no mean delegation, even as to numbers; and as to intellectual and moral force they were a mighty host, and their presence was highly appreciated by thousands. As for the Reformed Church from abroad, it was numerous and highly respectable. From France, from Switzerland, from Germany, and from Holland, more than a score were present. Only from the Reformed Church of our own country (our own branch of it, we mean) we had no corresponding representation. We feel humiliated at the thought, but especially when we think of the reason *why* it was not otherwise.

As regards the second defect referred to by the professor, it is somewhat singular that he should take it so much to heart that that side of Lutheranism should not be fully represented which *unchurches* the Reformed, and, indeed, all other Protestant denominations. In "that great word" spoken by Dr. Krauth in his book, he coolly hands the Reformed professor and his Church over to unchurchly sectarists. And is it for *this* that the professor feels bound to praise him? One cannot help being reminded of the keen irony of the Apostle in 2 Cor. xi. 20.—But the professor commits an egregious mistake when he makes Lutheranism responsible for such ultra High Church views. Dr. Krauth would represent a small fraction only of the Lutheran Church in Germany and America when combined. The separated Lutherans in Germany—the High Church—are a very small body, taking even the five or six different fractions existing there all together. The same is substantially true of this country, although we do not know how the case may stand relatively. But we doubt if, in the separated body to which Dr. K. belongs ("The Council"), a majority can be found to stand by his exclusive views. This, of course, does not concern us; but it concerns the criticism of our Reformed professor.

4. And when, finally, the professor regards it as a defect that the "churchly side" in Protestantism was not duly represented in the Alliance, and a wish is expressed that the Roman Church, even, might also be represented, in order to have "Roman and Protestant issues discussed," we cannot but marvel at his taste, as well as at the total misapprehension of the nature and object of the Alliance. Controversial discussion,—discussing prelacy and priesthood, the Papal Infallibility question, et cetera! Surely the professor has mistaken the foundation-principle of the Evangelical Alliance altogether. He seems to have in his mind a theological debating-society, in which all the discordant elements are to engage in a gladiatorial encounter. And then, when the fight is over, who is to act as umpire in behalf of the multitudinous combatants? Most devoutly would we say, From *such* an Assembly deliver us! and we cannot but believe our friend in Lancaster, with all his seeming calmness and gentleness, even towards his opponents, would be tempted to say, *Procul, O procul este, profani!*

THE BEST MODE OF COUNTERACTING MODERN INFIDELITY.

Professor Christlieb, of the University of Bonn, in Prussia, read a part only of a paper he had prepared on the above subject. But its effect upon the thousands who heard it was such that other thousands who heard of it requested that the lecture might be repeated, which was afterwards done, to the delight of all, notwithstanding it occupied two hours and forty-five minutes in its delivery. The effect is said to have been overpowering, and its publication in book-form has been requested, and it has already been printed. We give the following brief sketch of its leading points, as prepared by the editor of the New York *Observer*, who was the General Secretary of the Alliance. Prof. Christlieb said: The Church should eschew all methods of defending her faith which did not rest upon a spiritual and moral basis and look to the conversion of the objector. The subject was divided naturally under three heads. The first part was as to the encountering of unbelief in individuals. The best method was that by which the conscience and the heart could be reached. The inward causes and effects of unbelief upon the moral character were to be enlarged upon, not in an inquisitorial spirit, but in a sympathetic way. It should be shown that faith and knowledge were not antagonistic. *Comte* once thoughtfully paused before what he called the radical evil within us. The morality of men was defective. In Christ there was moral perfection, confessed even by Rationalistic critics. With regard to the best scientific method of defense, the positions were the clear definition of the fundamental articles of our faith as distinguished from the less important ones. In every fortress there was a central stronghold, then there was the *enceinte*,* and then the outside fortifications. The central position of Christianity *was the essential doctrine of the atonement* of Christ, reconciling men to God. Certain positions were indispensable to this,—our original need, and the love of God which carried out the atonement; the reception of the word into the heart, and the regeneration of the believer. The *enceinte* was the doctrine of Holy Scripture as the record of Divine revelation. The outer circle comprised such matters as historical investigation and philosophical speculation. The outer circle should not be given up prematurely; but a wise defender would withdraw from it sooner than risk the inner fort. With regard to philosophy, the harmony and symmetry of the Christian system had to be demonstrated, and it could be shown how the isolated conceptions of truth outside of revelation converged towards a focus in the Biblical system. Without embarrassing opponents with such questions as the positive and substantial results of these speculations, what were their main positions? (The professor rapidly sketched some of the main philosophical theories prevalent in Germany.) Such views, if impartially examined, led to the conclusion that the faith of the Christian was the only star of hope for humanity. Let us boldly attack unbelievers on this their weak point. In all natural and pantheistic systems the spiritual capacities of man were

* *Enceinte*—a French military term, which means the wall or inclosure of a place, citadel, etc.,—the outer defense.

sacrificed. With reference to the German general notion of inspiration, he would guard against any exaggerated theory of inspiration, as placing undue advantage in the hands of opponents. The canon of Scripture was not apostolically announced; but was it not probable that the Spirit guided the Church in the adoption of the canon? From the inner spirit of the canonical Scriptures the strongest proof of their authority should be drawn. If chronological and other disputes arose, it was wise to say, in the spirit of Luther, "What matter, if it does not invalidate our central truths?" He would say, "What cannot be denied need not be feared." But if criticism sought to invalidate revelation, it should be boldly met. The objection to the resurrection, for instance, should be met with the rejoinder that primitive Christianity cannot be explained if Christ did not do what the Gospels alleged. He would also advise stripping modern skepticism of the claim of novelty. With regard to the attacks of anti-miraculous, natural science, a sharp line must be drawn between the end and object of Scripture and of natural science. The latter dealt with things as they are, and could not penetrate into the spiritual and invisible world. A stand should then be taken on the general harmony already established between Biblical cosmogony and science. As to the generation of man from mere natural forces, the argument should be drawn from man's moral self-consciousness pointing to a Divine origin and the unity of the race. With reference to the attacks on Christianity as a social power, there were two lines of defense:—first, the historic method, as to the effects and spirit of infidelity. "By their fruits ye shall know them." The proof that the fruit of infidelity was corrupt and corrupting was very convincing. The professor scathingly exposed the spirit of modern infidelity, its shallow learning, the poor substitutes it afforded to humanity for the ennobling and sublime doctrines of revealed religion, and its want of practical results tending to the welfare of man. In the last continental war the great task of succoring the wounded and needy fell upon the Church. Christianity was the bond that held humanity together,—the true conservative influence of society. In fact, not only as Christians, but as citizens and patriots, they must protest against infidelity. The second line of defense was the practical religious method,—the actual proof of Christian truth by the actual fruits of a Christian life. Narrow-minded prejudices must be laid aside. This conference was a practical proof of Christian life. The Christian was the world's Bible. The strongest argument for the truth of Christianity was the true Christian. The best proof of Christ's resurrection was a living Church. Meanwhile, the world was fast becoming divided into two hostile camps,—the unbelievers and the faithful. Every church and every nation should contribute its peculiar talent for the defense and honor of the truth, in intellectual argument, in courageous living, in benevolence, in love.

"It is impossible," says Dr. Prime, "to convey in writing any idea of the effect produced by the paper of Professor Christlieb of which the above is a meagre outline. The audience listened with rapt attention, and at the close broke forth into shouts of approval; great relief was produced by the singing of the verses,

"'Dear dying Lamb, thy precious blood
Shall never lose its power.'"

WHAT IS TO BE THE EFFECT?

This question is on the lips of all who have enjoyed the wonderful meeting of the Evangelical Alliance. It is confessed on all hands that the Conference was attended with signal evidence of Divine power, and that those who were present enjoyed a revival of religion extraordinary in its character and unprecedented in its immediate usefulness. So far as we have knowledge from tradition and history, no religious convention in any period of time, in any country, ever commanded such attention, or so powerfully and instantaneously affected the public mind. It was manifested in the Conference, in all its sections and popular meetings, that the people were not running after novelties or seeking sensations. They desired religious instruction. The ablest essays developing strong religious sentiment and feeding the soul with the profoundest religious truth were heard with the highest satisfaction; while the unpremeditated exhortation, however warm and brilliant, was regarded as a waste of precious time. The people came to learn the way of God more perfectly, and in hearing they found great reward.

On those who enjoyed the rare privilege of attending the meetings the effect was mighty for good. And the effect, also, on the interests of evangelical religion in the city and in the whole country has been powerful and happy. It has exhibited an intellectual strength and an amount of learning and zeal *on that side*, which the free religionists and other enemies of the gospel had not imagined that truth could command.

And what is to be done about it now? It should be followed by such results as will make it felt in all the cities and villages and rural districts of this whole country. It should mark an era in the history of Christian union, united religious effort, closer relationship and more ardent love among all the followers of Christ, of whatever name. All over the land Christians ought to associate themselves into Alliances, irrespective of denominations, and auxiliary to the great Alliance of the United States, thus constituting themselves members of it, and increasing its power. In all these places such Unions will bring Christians of many religious names into harmonious action for the promotion of good works, while by the principles of the Alliance the denominational peculiarities and relations of all are left undisturbed. Such unity of effort and prayer, in all places, will not fail to give fresh impulse to evangelical religion. It would be in the best sense of the word a REVIVAL. That God would take pleasure in such a result there can be no doubt; and it is equally certain that the best spiritual interests of the people would be promoted.

CHRIST INCARNATE IF MAN HAD NOT SINNED.

[To corroborate what is said on p. 19, the following extract is given:]

"It is quite evident that even had the angels in heaven never rebelled and dragged men through their temptations into sin and misery, still He would have united Himself, in some form, to the human race, so as to raise it beyond the position which it occupied in Paradise. Intimations of this fact, clear and forcible, abound in the revelation of God; and the nature of man and the nature of Christ both demand this."—*Dr. Gans*, in the *Messenger* of Dec. 24, 1873.

BX 9571

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 028 310 267 1